

Herausgegeben von:

Thomas Corsten
Fritz Mitthof
Bernhard Palme
Hans Taeuber

TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

 **HOLZHAUSEN**
DER VERLAG

Band 26, 2011



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 28

2033

**HOLZHAUSEN
DER VERLAG**

Gegründet von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert, Ekkehard Weber

Herausgegeben von:

TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich

Vertreten durch:

Thomas Corsten, Fritz Mitthof, Bernhard Palme, Hans Taeuber

Gemeinsam mit:

Franziska Beutler und Wolfgang Hameter

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat:

Angelos Chaniotis, Denis Feissel, Nikolaos Gonis,
Klaus Hallof, Anne Kolb, Michael Peachin

Redaktion:

Olivier Gengler, Sandra Hodeček, Claudia Macho, Theresia Pantzer,
Georg Rehrenböck, Patrick Sängler, Kerstin Sängler-Böhm

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und
Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, 1010 Wien, Österreich.

e-mail: franziska.beutler@univie.ac.at

Richtlinien unter <http://www.univie.ac.at/alte-geschichte>.

Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien
office@verlagholzhausen.at

Online Bestellungen & TYCHE-Digital:

<https://shop.verlagholzhausen.at>

Umschlag: Militärdiplom aus Carnuntum (ZPE 172, 2010, 271–276; Photo: P. Böttcher), Inschrift aus
Ephesos (ÖJh 55, 1984, 130 [Inv. Nr. 4297]; Photo: P. Sängler), P.Vindob. G 2097 (= P.Charite 8).

**Bibliografische Informationen der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek
und der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek**

Die ÖNB und die DNB verzeichnen diese Publikation in den Nationalbibliografien; detaillierte
bibliografische Daten sind im Internet abrufbar. Für die Österreichische Bibliothek:
<http://aleph.onb.ac.at>, für die Deutsche Bibliothek: <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

Herausgeber: TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien,
Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.
e-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder bernhard.palme@univie.ac.at

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Verlagsort: Wien — Herstellungsort: Wien — Printed in Austria

ISBN: 978-3-902868-07-7

Copyright © 2012 Verlag Holzhausen GmbH — Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Stadt Wien
Wien ist anders.

Diese Publikation wurde durch die
freundliche Unterstützung der Stadt Wien
ermöglicht.

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Géza A l f ö l d y † (Heidelberg): Eine umstrittene Altarinschrift aus Vindobona (Taf. 1–4).....	1
Amin B e n a i s s a (Oxford): An Arsinoite Landowner and <i>Clarissimus Magister</i> of a Military Unit (Taf. 5).....	23
Lincoln H. B l u m e l l (Provo): A Second-Century AD Letter of Introduction in the Washington State University Collection (Taf. 6–7).....	33
Francesco C a m i a (Athen): Spending on the <i>agones</i> . The financing of festivals in the cities of Roman Greece.....	41
Ulrike E h m i g — Rudolf H a e n s c h (München): Adabei. Prominenz in und aus Epirus (Taf. 8–12).....	77
Denver G r a n i n g e r (Sofia): ‘In as much land as the Pheraioi rule’. A note on SEG 23, 418.....	87
Ortolf H a r l (Wien): Polybios bereist um 150 v. Chr. die östliche Cisalpinia und besucht die norischen Taurischer (Taf. 13–16).....	91
Herbert H e f t n e r (Wien): Hopliten und Hippeis unter dem Regime der ‚Dreißig Tyrannen‘ in Athen.....	141
Katharina K r e n n (Wien): Cleanders Stellung am Hof des Commodus. Zur Deutung des Titels <i>a pugione</i>	165
Federico M o r e l l i (Wien): Dal Mar Rosso ad Alessandria. Il <i>verso</i> (ma anche il <i>recto</i>) del ‘papiro di Muziris’ (SB XVIII 13167).....	199
Patrick S ä n g e r (Heidelberg): Neue Inschriften aus der nördlichen Außenmauer des ephesischen Theaters (Taf. 16–18).....	235
Kerstin S ä n g e r - B ö h m (Wien): Der ἐπίτροπος χαρτηρῶς und der <i>procurator rationis chartariae</i> . Zwei Prokuratoren im Dienste der Papyrusversorgung Roms.....	247
Ekkehard W e b e r — Ingrid W e b e r - H i d e n (Wien): Annona epigraphica Austriaca 2010.....	259
Bemerkungen zu Papyri XXIV (<Korr. Tyche> 690–715).....	289
Adnotationes epigraphicae II (<Adn. Tyche> 9–25) (Taf. 19–20).....	301
Buchbesprechungen.....	307
<p>Julien A l i q u o t, <i>Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie 11 — Mont Hermon (Liban et Syrie)</i>, Beyrouth 2008 (P. Alpass: 307) — Nicolò Giuseppe B r a n c a t o, <i>Repertorium delle trasmissioni del gentilizio nel mondo romano sulla base della documentazione epigrafica. Vol. I Provinciae</i>, Roma 2009; Id., <i>Repertorium delle trasmissioni del gentilizio nel mondo romano sulla base della documentazione epigrafica. Vol. II Italia — Epilogus</i>, Roma 2011 (F. Cenerini: 310) — Giuseppe C a m o d e c a, <i>I ceti dirigenti di rango senatorio equestre e decurionale</i></p>	

Inhaltsverzeichnis

della Campania romana I, Napoli 2008 (F. Feraudi-Gruénais: 313) — Manfred C l a u s s, *Große Gestalten der Antike*. Berlin 2010 (P. D. Moser: 319) — Jean-Christophe C o u v e n h e s, Silvia M i l a n e z i (Hrsg.), *Individus, groupes et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate. Actes du colloque internationale Tours 7 et 8 mars 2005*, Tours 2007 (Ch. Samitz: 320) — Julien F o u r n i e r, *Entre tutelle romaine et autonomie civique. L'administration judiciaire dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain (129 av. J.-C. – 235 apr. J.-C.)*, Athènes 2010 (P. Sánchez: 324) — Klaus Martin G i r a r d e t, *Der Kaiser und sein Gott. Das Christentum im Denken und in der Religionspolitik Konstantins des Großen*, Berlin, New York 2010 (H. Förster: 330) — Bernard G r e e n, *Christianity in Ancient Rome. The First Three Centuries*, London, New York 2010 (H. Förster: 335) — Monika R. M. H a s i t z k a, *Koptische dokumentarische und literarische Texte. Corpus Papyrorum Raineri (CPR), Band XXXI*, Berlin, New York 2011 (G. Schenke: 338) — Vincent H u n i n k (Hrsg.), *Glücklich ist dieser Ort! 1000 Graffiti aus Pompeji, Lateinisch/Deutsch*, Stuttgart 2011 (E. Weber: 342) — Arno H ü t t e m a n n (Hrsg.), *Pompejanische Inschriften. Der heutige Bestand vor Ort im Stadtgebiet und in den Nekropolen, Lateinisch/Deutsch*, Stuttgart 2010 (E. Weber: 343) — Éva J a k a b, *Risikomanagement beim Weinkauf. Periculum und Praxis im Imperium Romanum*, München 2009 (K. Ruffing: 345) — Andrea J ö r d e n s, *Statthalterliche Verwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit: Studien zum praefectus Aegypti*, Stuttgart 2009 (S. Schmidt: 347) — Anne K o l b (Hrsg.), *Augustae. Machtbewusste Frauen am römischen Kaiserhof? Akten der Tagung in Zürich 18.–20. 9. 2008*, Berlin 2010 (K. Sängler-Böhm: 352) — Fanette L a u b e n h e i m e r, Élise M a r l i è r e, *Échanges et vie économique dans le Nord-Ouest des Gaules: Le témoignage des amphores du II^e siècle après J.-C.*, Franche-Comté 2010 (T. Bezczyk: 356) — Yann L e B o h e c, *Das römische Heer in der Späten Kaiserzeit*, Stuttgart 2010 (A. Kaiser: 358) — Christian M a r e k (unter Mitarbeit von Peter F r e i), *Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike*, München 2010 (G. Kantor: 361) — Stefanie M a r t i n - K i l c h e r, Regula S c h a t z m a n n (Hrsg.), *Das römische Heiligtum von Thun-Allmendigen, die Regio Lindensis und die Alpen*, Bern 2009 (V. Gassner: 363) — Elizabeth A. M e y e r, *Metics and the Athenian Phialai-Inscriptions: A Study in Athenian Epigraphy and Law*, Wiesbaden 2009 (Ph. Scheibelreiter: 366) — György N é m e t h, *Kritias und die Dreißig Tyrannen. Untersuchungen zur Politik und Prosopographie der Führungselite in Athen 404/403 v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 2006 (H. Heftner: 369) — Peter P i l h o f e r, *Das Neue Testament und seine Welt*, Tübingen 2010 (E. Weber: 373) — Peter R i e d l b e r g e r, *Philologischer, historischer und liturgischer Kommentar zum 8. Buch der Johannis des Goripp, nebst kritischer Edition und Übersetzung*, Groningen 2010 (D. Weber: 376) — Margaret A. R o b b, *Beyond Populares and Optimates. Political Language in the Late Republic*, Stuttgart 2010 (K.-J. Hölkeskamp: 377) — Denis R o u s s e t, *De Lycie en Cabalide. La convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos près d'Oinoanda*, Genève 2010 (F. Kolb: 383) — Francesca S c h i r o n i, *TO MEFA BIBAION: Book-Ends, End-Titles and Coronides in Papyri with Hexametric Poetry*, Durham, NC 2010 (M. Perale: 385) — Michael Alexander S p e i d e l, *Heer und Herrschaft im römischen Reich der Hohen Kaiserzeit*, Stuttgart 2009 (S. Bönisch: 390) — Stefan T r a x l e r, *Die römischen Grabdenkmäler von Lauriacum und Lentia. Stein – Relief – Inschrift*, Linz 2009 (Th. Pantzer: 392) — Richard V e y m i e r s, *Ἐλεος τῷ φοροῦντι. Sérapis sur les gemmes et les bijoux antiques*, Bruxelles 2009 (G. Dembski: 396) — Catherine W o l f f, *Déserteurs et transfuges dans l'armée romaine à l'époque républicaine*, Napoli 2009 (Ch. Lundgreen: 397).

Indices..... 403

Eingelangte Bücher..... 407

Tafeln 1–20

FRANCESCO CAMIA

Spending on the *agones*
The financing of festivals in the cities of Roman Greece

Introduction

Festivals occupied a very important place in the religious as well as, more generally, the cultural and social life of Greek cities. Quite naturally, as these events entailed several expenses, they also represented a financial burden for the civic budget. In this paper I will deal with the financing of religious festivals — and of related activities, such as those connected with gymnasia — in the cities of mainland Greece during the Late Hellenistic and Imperial periods¹, and will analyse the strategies adopted by these cities to cope with the costs of such events. Before doing so, however, I will briefly consider the nature of Greek religious festivals, focusing in particular on their social and economic implications.

1. The complex nature of Greek festivals

Although athletic and musical competitions represented the main event of many Greek festivals, and probably the most attractive one for those who attended them, one should not forget that such contests usually took place in the context of a religious feast consecrated to a god. Greek festivals were first of all religious celebrations, during which sacrifices and other cult rituals were performed for local and traditional gods as well as, starting from the imperial period, Roman emperors and other members of the imperial family. Festivals were not exclusively religious occasions though. In fact, a *panegyris* — a term etymologically indicating a gathering of people² — was a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, including religious, social and economic aspects, in addition to the athletic and artistic features represented by the *agones*³.

* I thank F. Guizzi, Ch. Kokkinia, H. Müller, S. Privitera, A.D. Rizakis and S. Zoumbaki for their suggestions, and M. Metcalfe for kindly revising my English. A shorter preliminary version of this paper was presented at a workshop on the economy of Roman Greece held at Aegion (Greece) in June 2009; I thank all the participants for their useful comments and suggestions. Any remaining shortcomings are my responsibility alone.

¹ The evidence discussed below covers mainly the period from the 2nd c. B.C. to the 3rd c. A.D.

² De Ligt, De Neeve 1988, 392–396; De Ligt 1993, 35–39; Chandezon 2000, 74–76; Deshours 2006, 90.

³ De Ligt, De Neeve 1988, 397–399.

Festivals were "a welcome diversion from the tedium of daily life" and an occasion to meet new people⁴. Particularly for the poor, festivals could also represent a means of support, albeit partial and temporary, as they not infrequently included banquets and distributions of food and even money⁵.

Festivals also functioned as an ideal stage for the euergetic activities of the members of civic elites, who played a fundamental role in the promotion, organization and funding of such events. I shall shortly deal with the financing of festivals in the cities of Greece. For now, suffice it to say that such celebrations entailed many expenses and that by the Late Hellenistic period civic aristocracies came to sustain more and more of the burden of those costs. By assuming the presidency of the games (*agonothesia*) and holding other magistracies, as well as by making donations or setting up endowments to fund the celebration of a festival, members of the elite displayed their economic and social power and pre-eminence. To put it differently, to act as a benefactor was one of the ways in which the local notables expressed and stressed their privileged social standing, thus strengthening their position at the top of society. Following the integration of the Roman emperors into the frame of traditional Greek festivals, the role of the elites was further enhanced, since their euergetic activities were now also demonstrating the loyalty of their communities towards the imperial power⁶.

Religious festivals also had economic implications, since such celebrations gathered many people together and created favourable conditions for commercial activities, conditions from which both merchants or sellers and the organizing city as a whole could profit. Several sources, both literary and epigraphic, show that religious festivals were often accompanied by fairs and markets, and in a celebrated passage Strabo describes the *panegyris* at Delos as "a kind of commercial affair"⁷. We know from Pausanias, for example, that tradesmen exchanged several types of goods (slaves, cattle of all kinds, clothes, silver and gold) during the third and last day of the festival celebrated in honour of Isis in the Phocidian *polis* of Tithorea⁸. The presence

⁴ Bekker-Nielsen 2008, 74.

⁵ Sartre 1991, 152 (and n. 8). On banquets and distributions see the exhaustive analysis of P. Schmitt Pantel, *La cité au banquet. Histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques*, Rome 1992 (esp. 291–420); cf. also L. Bruit Zuidman, *Ritual eating in Archaic Greece: parasites and paretroi*, in: J. Wilkins, D. Harvey, M. Dobson (eds.), *Food in Antiquity*, Exeter 1995, 196–203.

⁶ S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1984, 100, 233; R. Gordon, *The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrificers and Benefactors*, in: M. Beard, J. North (eds.), *Pagan Priests. Religion Power in the Ancient World*, London 1990, 224 (and n. 68); A. D. Rizakis, *Urban Elites in the Roman East: Enhancing Regional Positions and Social Superiority*, in: J. Rüpke (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Religion*, Oxford 2007, 317.

⁷ Strab. 10, 5, 4 (trans. by H. L. Jones, Loeb).

⁸ Paus. 10, 32, 15–16. At Oinoanda (Lycia) a market took place during the festival of the *Demostheneia*, founded by the local benefactor C. Iulius Demosthenes (Wörrle 1988, 8, l. 40, and 209–215). For other examples of fairs associated with festivals in the Greek East see De Ligt, De Neeve 1988, 403–409; De Ligt 1993, 64–75. On commercial and economic implications of religious festivals see R. MacMullen, *Market-days in the Roman Empire*, Phoenix

of commercial activities during a festive celebration is not at all surprising, as such a combination is also attested in other epochs and holds true in our age as well⁹. The influx of visitors to a city during a festival had positive effects on the local economy, since it "enlarged the market for local services and produce, both agricultural and manufactured"¹⁰, as Dio of Prusa had already noted in one of his orations, observing that "not only can those who have goods to sell obtain the highest prices, but also no one in the city is out of work ... And this contributes not a little to prosperity, for wherever the greatest crowd of people gathers together, there we are bound to find the most money"¹¹. Furthermore, markets and fairs that took place during a religious festival represented a source of additional revenues for a city, as the latter could levy taxes on the import and export of products and on commercial transactions, as well as various duties (e.g. for the occupation of public soil, the use of public scales, etc.), in addition to collecting revenues from the lease of public workshops and booths for artisans and merchants¹². With regard to this, we could even say that for a city to organize a festival could be regarded as a sort of 'investment': its financial costs would have been (at least partly) repaid thanks to the spending of visitors¹³.

Panhellenic festivals like the *Olympia* and the *Isthmia* attracted a large public. During the imperial period, the Olympic games assumed an even stronger ecumenical character, as shown by the occurrence in inscriptions of epithets such as οἰκουμένη, and by the increase in the number of athletes from the East¹⁴. The massive influx of visitors who reached the sanctuary to attend the games led the Elean officials to take measures regulating their arrival as well as their accommodation and behaviour during the days of the contests¹⁵. That the accommodation of visitors, and particularly of athletes, was an important concern for cities hosting agonistic festivals is shown, for example, by one of the numerous benefactions performed in favour of the Isthmian

24 (1970) 333–341; De Ligt, De Neeve 1988; De Ligt 1993, *passim*; O. Van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*, Amsterdam 1997, 139–146; Chandezon 2000, 92–96.

⁹ De Ligt, De Neeve 1988, 398 (n. 30), and 400; Van Nijf, *Associations* (cf. n. 8), 139–140.

¹⁰ A. J. S. Spawforth, *Agonistic Festivals in Roman Greece*, in: S. Walker, A. Cameron (eds.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire*, London 1989, 196.

¹¹ Dion Chrys. *Or.* 35, 15–16 (trans. by H. Lamar Crosby, Loeb); cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 185; D. O. A. Klose, *Festivals and Games in the Cities of the Roman East during the Roman Empire*, in: Ch. Howgego, V. Heuchert, A. Burnett (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford 2005, 125.

¹² Chandezon 2000, 85–86; for the lease of workshops and booths (with examples) cf. T. R. S. Broughton, *Roman Asia Minor*, in: T. Frank (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome IV*, Baltimore 1938, 800–801; Ph. Gauthier, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes II*, Genève 1989, 105, n. 68.

¹³ Broughton, *Asia Minor* (cf. n. 12), 899: "Funds ... for festivals and games, which brought visitors and aided business, were well used"; cf. De Ligt, De Neeve 1988, 411–412 (who are inclined to nuance this view). See *infra* for some examples.

¹⁴ A. Farrington, *Olympic Victors and the Popularity of the Olympic Games in the Imperial Period*, *Tyche* 12 (1997) 15–46 (esp. 17–19).

¹⁵ P. Siewert, *Due iscrizioni giuridiche della città di Elide*, *Minima epigraphica et papyrologica* III.3 (2000) 31–37.

sanctuary by the *archiereus* of the imperial cult P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus. Probably in his capacity as *agoranomos*, Iuventianus acquired at his own expense from the colony of Corinth a public stoa, which was in ruins, in order to have fifty lodgings built for the athletes competing in the Isthmian games; the governor of Achaia himself — whom the Corinthian authorities had evidently consulted — gave his official permission for this operation, on the condition that the athletes could always use the lodgings for free on the occasion of the *Isthmia*¹⁶. During the celebration of the Mysteries which took place at the sanctuary of Apollo Carneios (*Carneiasion*) in Messenia — about which we are informed by a long inscription known as the ‘sacred law’ of Andania¹⁷ — the sanctuary, located in the *chora* of Messene, was provided with tents where pilgrims and visitors could find shelter during the days of the festival¹⁸. The *agoranomos* of Messene — the *polis* which

¹⁶ *Corinth* 8.3, n° 306; cf. D. J. Geagan, *The Isthmian Dossier of P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus*, *Hesperia* 58 (1989) 349–360. The new structures (οἶκοι) will have served as shops when the festival was not in course; cf. L. Robert, *Un édifice du sanctuaire de l’Isthme dans une inscription de Corinthe*, in: *Hellenica I*, Limoges 1940, 48; Ch. Kokkinia, *The Role of Individuals in Inscribing Roman State Documents: Governors’ Letters and Edicts*, in: R. Haensch (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation. Die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der Römischen Welt*, München 2009, 201. The period when Iuventianus served as *archiereus* — probably in the Achaean league, although his title as high-priest (see *IG IV* 203, ll. 4–5; *Corinth* 8.3, n° 199) is never specified by any reference to the *koinon* — still remains a matter of debate, his priesthood having been dated from the end of the 1st to the end of the 2nd c. A.D.; cf. F. Camia, *IG IV 203: la cronologia di P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus, archiereus della Lega achea*, *ASAA* 80 (2002) 361–378 (with previous bibliography on the matter), arguing for the period before the reign of Hadrian [see the objections by A. Chaniotis in *Kernos* 19 (2006) 355, n° 24 (*SEG* 53, 2003, 283)], and most recently F. Camia, M. Kantiréa, *The Imperial Cult in the Peloponnese*, in: *RP III*, 400, suggesting the late 1st c. A.D.

¹⁷ *IG V* 1, 1390, on which see most recently Deshours 2006. This sacred regulation (*IG V* 1, 1390, l. 5: διάγραμμα) concerns the re-foundation of the cult of the Great Gods and the re-introduction of the Mysteries, both undertaken on the initiative of the Messenian Mnasistratos, who had gone to Argos to consult the oracle of Apollo Pythios “about the sacrifices and the Mysteries” (*Syll*³ 735). Based on the indication “55th year” which occurs several times in the text (ll. 10–11, 52, 54, 90), the latter is traditionally dated to 92/1 or 91/90 B.C., counting from the beginning of the so-called Achaean era (146/5 or 145/4 B.C.); cf. Deshours 2006, 51 (and nn. 11–12). *Contra* P. Themelis, *Ἀνασκαφή Μεσσήνης*, *PAAH* 156 (2001) 75–78, has suggested that this text should be dated to A.D. 24, counting the 55th year from the battle of Actium (31 B.C.); in his opinion, the inscription of Andania should be associated with the Messenian inscriptions concerning the *oktobolos eisphora* (*IG V* 1, 1432–1433) and it would define, as the latter, the rules for the collection of contributions for public works; cf. *RP II*, *MES* 276. See most recently N. Luraghi, *The Ancient Messenians. Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory*, Cambridge 2008, 295–300, who seems inclined to accept the lower chronology, and P. Themelis, *The economy and society of Messenia under Roman rule*, in: *RP III*, 93 (and n. 34).

¹⁸ The ‘law’ also states that these temporary tents must not be too big or sumptuous, evidently so as to conform to the holiness of the place and occasion (*IG V* 1, 1390, ll. 34–37); cf. Deshours 2006, 90.

organized and administered the Mysteries¹⁹ — was responsible for the material support of the pilgrims. In particular, he had to take care of the provision of water and to see that the bath which operated within the sanctuary from the fourth to the ninth hour (i.e. from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.) be provided with water, heating and tubs; every free-born man had access to the bath, upon payment of an entrance fee not exceeding two *chalkoi*²⁰.

As already noted, the presence of a large crowd at festivals created favourable conditions for local and itinerant merchants, who could sell their goods, so that the sanctuary (or the city) where the festival took place was turned into a sort of market, as shown by the term *mercatus* that some Roman authors used with reference to the Olympic games and other panhellenic festivals²¹. A very vivid image of what a sanctuary looked like on the occasion of a panhellenic festival is offered by Dio of Prusa, who in one of his orations describes — with manifest contempt — the large and varied crowd which gathered during the celebration of the Isthmian games, "when one could hear crowds of wretched sophists around Poseidon's temple shouting and reviling one another, and their disciples, as they were called, fighting with one another, many writers reading aloud their stupid works, many poets reciting their poems while others applauded them, many jugglers showing their tricks, many fortune-tellers interpreting fortunes, lawyers innumerable perverting judgment, and peddlers not a few peddling whatever they happened to have"²².

A fair took place during the celebration of the above mentioned Mysteries of Andania as well. The magistrate charged with the supervision of the regular course of the fair was the *agoranomos*. During the festival, in addition to looking after the material conditions of the pilgrims' daily life, this civic official had to verify that products were not faked (*ἄδολα καὶ καθάρᾳ*) and that sellers made use of weights and measures in keeping with the official ones: in other words, he had to make sure that commercial transactions took place regularly, most likely applying a specific law²³. Merchants were free to sell their goods at whatever price they liked and without any time limitation during the day, nor was a place due imposed on them (for occupation of public soil)²⁴.

¹⁹ Although Pausanias calls this festival the Mysteries of Andania (Paus. 4, 1, 7–9; 4, 2, 6; 4, 3, 10), it was organized by the city of Messene, not by Andania, which had probably turned into a *kome* of Messene by the first century B.C.; cf. Deshours 2006, 55–58.

²⁰ *IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 104–111; cf. Deshours 2006, 90–91. Cf. *IG V 1*, 20, A, l. 7 (Sparta; Trajanic): the gymnasiarch has to provide the oil in the *st[adion?]* during the days of the athletic contests of the *Leonideia* at Sparta.

²¹ Cic. *Tusc.* 5, 9; Vell. 1, 8, 1 (Olympic games); Liv. 33, 32, 1–3 (Isthmian games); see also Plin. *HN* 4, 66 (referring to the *panegyris* at Delos). Cf. I. Weiler, *Olympia – jenseits der Agonistik: Kultur und Spektakel*, Nikephoros 10 (1997) 191–213; Zoumbaki 2001, 58–60.

²² Dion Chrys. *Or.* 8, 9 (trans. by J. W. Cohoon, Loeb).

²³ As was the case, for example, in Athens (Demosth. *Lept.* 9); cf. É. Jakab, *Praedicere und cavere beim Marktkauf. Sachmängel im griechischen und römischen Recht*, München 1997, 73–74.

²⁴ *IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 99–101; cf. Deshours 2006, 91–92. On place dues see Chandezon 2000, 97. At the fair which took place during the *Demostheneia* of Oinoanda (Lycia), the three

Fairs similar to those attested by literary and epigraphic evidence at the *Olympia*, *Isthmia*, at the Mysteries of Andania and at Tithorea in Phocis will have certainly taken place, in connection with religious festivals, in several other places of Greece. Commercial activities took place, for example, at the Spartan *Leonideia*, a traditional festival celebrated in memory of Leonidas and Pausanias — the Spartan heroes of Thermopylae and Platea respectively — and re-organized probably late in the age of Trajan, as shown by an inscription containing a provision granting tradesmen and sellers exemption (*ateleia*) from import and market taxes²⁵. Moreover, the presence of a *panegyris*, and therefore, most likely, of some sort of commercial activities, can also be inferred by the reference to *panegyriarchai*²⁶.

Thus, we can say that the organization of a festival, particularly if sacred and Panhellenic, contributed to a city's general prosperity. Independently of the undoubted economic benefactions linked to festivals, however, when trying to explain their proliferation in the cities of the Roman East during the imperial period, one should also take into account the social and political aspects (the latter connected with the proliferation of the imperial cult) I have mentioned above. Moreover, a renowned festival was in itself an important source of prestige for the organizing *polis*, as it attracted visitors and spread the fame of that *polis*²⁷.

2. Festival costs and civic finances

Prestige, however, had its costs, as the organization of a festival represented an appreciable financial burden for a city, entailing several expenses such as those for the celebration of sacrifices and banquets, the construction or restoration of buildings and displays used for the athletic and theatrical events, the remuneration of attendants and artists performing in the regular contests or in supplementary spectacles (*ἐπιδείξεις*), the provision of prizes for victors in the *agones*. The latter was certainly one of the most expensive items. In the account (*apologia*) of an *agonothetes* of the *Serapieia* of

panegyriarchai (on the term see *infra*, n. 26) who took charge of the market had the power to fix the prices for the purchase of provisions (Wörrle 1988, 10, ll. 59–62, and 209–215).

²⁵ *IG V 1*, 18, ll. 11–12. The *Demostheneia* of Oinoanda enjoyed tax-free status for all commercial transactions: this privileged status, applying to items "which are imported, introduced, sold, exported, and put up for sale during the days of the festival" (Wörrle 1988, 16, ll. 109–110), needed the authorization of the governor of Lycia, Flavius Aper (Wörrle 1988, 14, ll. 99–102). Cf. H. Engelmann, D. Knibbe, *Das Zollgesetz der Provinz Asia*, EA 14 (1989) 125–129 (*ateleia* at the *Rhomaia Sebasta* of Pergamum); see also F. Dunand, *Sens et fonction de la fête dans la Grèce hellénistique. Les cérémonies en l'honneur d'Artémis Leukophryéné*, DHA 4 (1978) 206 (and n. 31); Chandezon 2000, 87–91.

²⁶ At Athens the *panegyriarches* was charged with the material support of the visitors during the Eleusinian festival (Plut. *symp.* 5, 5, 2 (679b); cf. Geagan 1967, 136); see also *IG V 1*, 36 (Spartan *Ourania*); *Corinth* 8.3, n° 127. This official appears in the epigraphic evidence starting from the first half of the 2nd c. B.C., and gradually came to replace the *agoranomos* attached to the *panegyris*; its functions were basically the same (general supervision on the commercial transactions, provision of supplies); cf. De Ligt 1993, 43–44; Chandezon 2000, 85; see also *supra*, n. 24.

²⁷ De Ligt, De Neeve 1988, 412–413.

Tanagra, in Boeotia, dated to the beginning of the 1st c. B.C., the sum spent for the prizes amounted to 2,470 drachmas, 2,070 for the first prizes (consisting in golden crowns), and the rest for the second (cash) prizes; in addition, 46 drachmas were given as payment to the goldsmith who had made the crowns²⁸. Prizes for HS 87,760 are registered in an incomplete *logismos* of a Spartan *agonothetes* (of the *Ourania* or the *Eurycleia*) dated to the middle of the 2nd c. A.D., while at the Spartan *Leonideia*, on the occasion of its reorganization — probably late in the reign of Trajan — the endowment for the cash prizes amounted apparently to HS 120,000²⁹. A detailed review of the expenses connected with an agonistic festival is now provided by a recently published inscription of the late 2nd c. B.C. concerning the pan-boeotic festival of the *Delia* celebrated at the sanctuary of Apollo in the territory of Tanagra. The *agonothetes* Damon spent a little less than 7,000 drachmas to cover the various costs of this festival (sacrifices, prizes, remunerations, sacred equipment, and so on)³⁰. In addition to the ordinary items of a festival's budget, some exceptional expenses can appear sometimes in connection with the celebration of a *panegyris* (although they are not directly linked to the latter). One *agonothetes* of the *Ptoia* of Akraiphia in the 1st c. B.C., for example, declares in his account (*apologia*) that he has spent 2,477 drachmas for the cutting of the rock in front of the Temple of Apollo *Ptoios* and the removal of a wall delimitating the open-space where the temple stood³¹. Another agonothetic account of the *Ptoia*, similarly dated to the 1st c. B.C., registers some expenses regarding the repair of the *proskenion* (unknown sum), the polishing and upkeep of the cult statues (294 drachmas), and the fabrication of beds (*klinai*; 99 drachmas), probably used during the banquets that took place in the area of the *Ptoion*³².

Cities could have problems in coping with such costs; around A.D. 180, for example, Aphrodisias asked the *curator rei publicae* M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurycles to look into the funds financing their festivals³³. The importance of this issue, with

²⁸ Calvet, Roesch 1966, 298–300 (ll. 20–43) and 307–309; on this inscription see also *infra*, n. 49.

²⁹ *Logismos*: SEG 11, 1954, 838 (A.D. 143–148); cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 188. *Leonideia*: IG V 1, 18–20; cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 192. Cf. also Wörrle 1988, 8, ll. 39–46, and 234–236 (on the prizes at the *Demostheneia* of Oinoanda).

³⁰ C. Brélaz, A. Andreiomenou, P. Ducrey, *Les premiers comptes du sanctuaire d'Apollon à Délion et le concours pan-béotien des Delia*, BCH 131 (2007) 246–247 (ll. 6–29) and 252–258.

³¹ L. Bizard, *Fouilles du Ptoion (1903) II. Inscriptions*, BCH 44 (1920) 252, ll. 36–45; cf. *ibidem*, 255–261.

³² IG VII 4149, ll. 17–23; cf. Migeotte 2006, 20–21, who rightly notes that only the latter item (the fabrication of *klinai*) could be considered as directly linked to the celebration of the festival. See also CID IV 57 (Delphi; ca. 250 B.C.): accounts of works regarding various structures of the sanctuary of Apollo (indoor and outdoor track, stadium, gymnasium, odeum, etc.) performed before the celebration of the *Pythia*; cf. J. Pouilloux, *Travaux à Delphes à l'occasion des Pythia*, in: *Études delphiques* (BCH Suppl. 4), Athènes 1977, 103–123.

³³ C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and Late Roman Periods*, London 1993, 164, n° 50; see also *ibidem*, n° 51 and J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome. Documents from the excavations of the theatre at Aphrodisias conducted by Professor*

regard to city life in the Greek communities of the Empire, emerges more clearly if one considers that during the imperial period there was a flourishing of agonistic festivals in the Greek East. As has been noted, it seems that between the 2nd and 3rd centuries games and festivals came even to replace building activities in the scale of urban priorities, so as to become one of the most substantial items of expenditure in the city budget; to cite S. Mitchell, "there are indications that the balance swung in favour of festivals as the second century progressed, and that this became irreversible after the Severan period"³⁴. This change is also reflected by the fact that in some cases games and festivals became a source of specific concern (and warnings) by the central authority. In the text of the well known foundation set up under Hadrian by C. Iulius Demosthenes at Oinoanda, the governor of Lycia, Flavius Aper, subjected the granting of the tax-free status of all commercial activities during the days of the festival of the *Demostheneia* to the condition that the citizens of Oinoanda "take care that the city's revenues are in no way diminished"³⁵. The Emperor Marcus Aurelius showed a similar concern in A.D. 177 in replying to the Milesians, who had asked him permission to promote the festival of the *Didymeia* to the status of sacred games following the accession of Commodus: Marcus' reply reveals his concern to prevent other cities from undertaking the financial burden of such festivals³⁶. In the same year a *senatus consultum* was enacted in order to put limits on spending on gladiatorial shows; it applied to both western and eastern provinces³⁷. As regards more specifically

Kenan T. Erim, *together with some related texts*, London 1982, n° 62: two letters to Aphrodisias, maybe both by the same *curator*, the former regarding the funds specifically allocated for festivals and games, the second the civic funds in their entirety. For the *curators rei publicae* see *infra* (and n. 40).

³⁴ Mitchell 1990, 190; cf. Rizakis, *Urban Elites* (cf. n. 6), 319.

³⁵ Wörrle 1988, 16, ll. 115–116.

³⁶ P. Herrmann, *Eine Kaiserurkunde der Zeit Marc Aurels aus Milet*, MDAI(I) 25 (1975) 149–166; *AE* 1977, 801; cf. Mitchell 1990, 190.

³⁷ Two versions of this legislation have been found, one (much longer) at Italica in Spain, the other at Sardis in Asia Minor: *ILS* 5163; J. L. Gómez-Pantoja, *Epigrafía anfiteatral de l'Occidente romano VII: Baetica, Lusitania, Hispania Citerior*, Roma 2009, n° 3 (*Aes Italicense*); W. H. Buckler, D. M. Robinson, *Sardis VII. Greek and Latin Inscriptions. Part I*, Leyden 1932, n° 16 (*Marmor Sardianum*); cf. J. H. Oliver, R. E. A. Palmer, *Minutes of an Act of the Roman Senate*, *Hesperia* (1955) 320–349; Rizakis 1998, 63; M. Carter, *Gladiatorial ranking and the SC de pretiis gladiatorum minuendis (CIL II 6278 = ILS 5163)*, *Phoenix* 57 (2003) 83–114; K. M. Coleman, *Exchanging gladiators for an aqueduct at Aphrodisias (SEG 50.1096)*, *Acta Classica* 51 (2008) 38–39. See also Dio Cass. 52, 30, where Maecenas warns Augustus against excessive civic expenditure on both building and games; Maecenas' speech probably reflects "Cassius Dio's programme for prudent administration in the Severan age", as noted by Mitchell 1990, 190. Imperial concern for the economic implications of agonistic festivals is also revealed by a recently published inscription from Alexandria Troas (G. Petzl, E. Schwertheim, *Hadrian und die dionysischen Künstler. Drei in Alexandria Troas neugefundene Briefe des Kaisers an die Künstler-Vereinigung*, Bonn 2006) containing three epistles of Hadrian to the ecumenical synod of the Dionysiac *technitai*, that deal (particularly the first letter) with prizes and rewards as well as, more generally, the material conditions of the members of the synod.

Greece, it is worth mentioning the Athenian *gerousia*. This body, composed by 400 members appointed according to age and wealth, was created at the end of the Principate of Marcus Aurelius (most likely with his encouragement) in order to cope with the financing of some festivals, and in particular with the *Panathenaia*, through the revenues from land holdings³⁸. These concerns sometimes resulted in direct interventions taking the form of imperial grants³⁹. In light of what has been said, such interventions cannot be regarded only as an expression of the traditional ‘paternalistic’ attitude of the imperial power towards its subjects, but also as the direct consequence of a real concern for the status of civic finances. Generally speaking, this concern became manifest, starting from the beginning of the 2nd c. A.D., with the appointment of imperial functionaries called *curatores rei publicae* who were charged with the temporary supervision of civic finances, and therefore of all activities, festivals included, that entailed public expenditure⁴⁰. The expenses for the celebration of Geta’s *dies imperii* in Athens (A.D. 209/10), including sacrifices for the whole of the imperial family and distributions to the people, needed the preliminary consent of the *logistes* (= *curator*) of the *polis* C. Licinius Telemachus, as indicated by the fact that the relevant decree was the result of a *gnome* of the Areopagus, the *boule* of 500 and the popular assembly, which had previously been submitted for approval to Telemachus, and most likely to the emperor himself, as it concerned honours for the imperial family⁴¹.

The issue of the funding of religious festivals and similar celebrations in the Graeco-Roman world is of course part of the wider and complex theme of civic finances (their nature and administration). Civic finances included sources of both public and private nature: taxes (direct and indirect); revenues from state and sacred properties (real estate, harbour and other public infrastructure, mines, etc.); public loans and subscriptions⁴²; foundations⁴³; *summae honorariae*, entrance fees for the

³⁸ J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia* (Hesperia Suppl. 6), Princeton 1941 (esp. 1, 5 and 28); idem, *Gerusiae and Augustales*, *Historia* 7 (1958) 476–477; Geagan 1967, 138–139; J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia and the Emperor’s Consilium*, *Hesperia* 36 (1967) 329–335; idem, *Marcus Aurelius. Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* (Hesperia Suppl. 13), Princeton 1970, 84–91.

³⁹ See *infra*.

⁴⁰ It should be noted, however, that the *curatores rei publicae*, due to their exceptional and temporary nature, cannot be merely equated with a diminution of local autonomy; moreover, it seems that the dispatch to a city of those functionaries was usually prompted by the cities themselves. On *curatores* in general cf. G. P. Burton, *The Curator Rei Publicae: towards a reappraisal*, *Chiron* 9 (1979) 465–488; G. Camodeca, *Ricerche sui curatores rei publicae*, in: ANRW II 13 (1980) 453–534; Fr. Jacques, *Les curateurs des cités dans l’Occident Romain de Trajan à Gallien*, Paris 1983. On *curatores* in Greece (province of Achaia) see F. Camia, *I curatores rei publicae nella provincia d’Acaia*, *MEFRA* 119.2 (2007) 409–419.

⁴¹ *IG II² 1077* (= *The Athenian Agora* 15, n° 460); cf. Camia, *Curatores* (cf. n. 40) 410–411.

⁴² Migeotte 1984; idem, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques*, Genève 1992.

⁴³ B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike: ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte I–II*, Berlin 1914; see also Duncan-Jones 1974, 80–82, 132–136; S. Mrozek, *Les distributions d’argent et de nourriture dans les villes italiennes du Haut-Empire romain*,

city councils, and other formal or customary financial obligations connected with local magistracies and charges (*munera*, λειτουργία)⁴⁴; benefactions by public officials and private individuals; gifts and grants from rulers⁴⁵. Bearing in mind this scheme, largely based on the evidence (mostly epigraphic) at our disposal, the sources of funding for festivals and similar celebrations can be divided into two main categories:

Bruxelles 1987; idem, *Le fonctionnement des fondations dans les provinces occidentales et l'économie de crédit à l'époque du Haut-Empire*, Latomus 59 (2000) 327–345.

⁴⁴ Cf. R. Duncan-Jones, *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy*, Cambridge 1990, 160–161. In Roman communities the payment of a fixed sum of money (*summa honoraria* or *legitima*), to be accomplished *e lege* by a magistrate or a civic priest upon entering his office, often took the form of a contribution towards the cost of games (or public works); cf. J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung I–II*, Leipzig ²1881–1885, I, 180–183; W. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Leipzig 1900, 54–65; Duncan-Jones 1974, 82–88, 147–155; Fr. Jacques, J. Scheid, *Rome et l'intégration de l'Empire (44 av. J.-C. — 260 ap. J.-C.)*. I. *Les structures de l'Empire romain*, Paris 1990, 255–256; Rizakis 1998, 61–62 (and nn. 1–4). In Greek cities similar practices, though well attested, did not become universal and were not institutionalized; cf. S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford 2005, 152–154 (see also Quass 1993, 328–334). For the entrance fee to city councils, cf. P. Garnsey, *Honorarium Decurionatus*, *Historia* 20 (1971) 309–325 and, for the Greek East, Dmitriev, *City Government* (op. cit.) 154–156. On *munera*, i.e. obligations to furnish (often costly) services, see Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung* (op. cit.) 417–430; W. Langhammer, *Die rechtliche und soziale Stellung der Magistratus Municipales und der Decuriones in der Übergangsphase der Städte von sich selbstverwaltenden Gemeinden zu Vollzugsorganen des spätantiken Zwangsstaates (2.–4. Jh. der römischen Kaiserzeit)*, Wiesbaden 1973, 237–262; L. Neesen, *Die Entwicklung der Leistungen und Ämter (munera et honores) im römischen Kaiserreich des zweiten bis vierten Jahrhundert*, *Historia* 30 (1981) 205–216; Dig. 27.1.6.8 (Modestinus) cites a letter of Hadrian addressed to an eastern province listing the most important types of *munera* at that time: supervision of the gymnasium and of the market-place, priesthoods, provision of billets, supply of grain and oil, jury-service, service on embassies, provision of army recruits, etc. The equivalent — *mutatis mutandis* — in Greek cities was the λειτουργία, a public function requiring that its holder covered out of his own pocket, in part or entirely, the expenses involved. Especially in the Greek (already by Hellenistic times), but also in the Roman world, the difference between magistracies (gr. ἀρχαί or τιμαί, lat. *honores*) and charges (gr. λειτουργία, lat. *munera*) was not so rigidly drawn; cf. F. Grelle, "Munus publicum". *Terminologia e sistematiche*, *Labeo* 7 (1961) 308–329 (= F. Grelle [L. Fanizza ed.], *Diritto e società nel mondo romano*, Roma 2005, 39–64); A. H. M. Jones (P. A. Brunt ed.), *The Roman Economy. Studies in Ancient Economic and Administrative History*, Oxford 1974, 173, n. 109; Jacques, Scheid, *Rome* (op. cit.), 255; Sartre 1991, 139–141; Quass 1993, 270–274, and most recently Bekker-Nielsen 2008, 69.

⁴⁵ On public finances of Greek cities see the review, focused on the 4th–1st c. B.C., by L. Migeotte, *Les finances publiques des cités grecques: bilan et perspective de recherche*, *Topoi* 5.1 (1995) 7–32, with presentation and discussion of the most relevant bibliography on the subject; for the imperial period cf. Broughton, *Asia Minor* (cf. n. 12), 797–812; A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford 1940, 241–250; J. Reynolds, *Cities*, in: D. C. Braund (ed.), *The administration of the Roman empire (241 BC–AD 193)*, Exeter 1988, 34–38; Sartre 1991, 134–138, and most recently Bekker-Nielsen 2008, 70–73; see also H. Galsterer, *Aspetti finanziari nel mondo antico: evergetismo e fiscalità nelle città romane*, in: *Atti della Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati*, Classe di Scienze umane, Classe di Lettere ed arti, ser. 7, vol. 8, A, fasc. 2 (1998) 75–98 (focused on the Roman cities).

a) public revenues (including sacred funds)⁴⁶; b) private funds, which cities had at their disposal as the result of more or less institutionalized forms of financial service by the office-holders involved in the organization of such celebrations (*in primis* the *agonothetai*) as well as supplementary benefactions performed by the same public officials or by well-to-do individuals, and in some cases also by the representatives of an external and higher authority such as Hellenistic monarchs, Roman emperors and imperial officials. A particular position is occupied by the agonistic foundations, located in some way at the intersection between public and private funding, since they consisted of donations of sums of money (or estates) to a city (or a sanctuary) by private individuals or magistrates, often in the form of a bequest: such donations were to be administered by civic officials in order to secure, usually for a long time, the financing of a given festival, according to the recommendations provided by the donor⁴⁷.

Thus, it can be said that on a general level the funding of festivals reflected the combined nature (public and private) of civic finances⁴⁸. The above mentioned account of the *Serapieia* of Tanagra, in Boeotia, dated to the beginning of the 1st c. B.C., offers an exemplary demonstration of this mixed system of financing⁴⁹. It contains an account (*apologia*) by the *agonothetes* of the pentaeteric *Serapieia*, Glaukos, who had received 3,000 drachmas for the ordinary costs of the festival from a civic board in charge of the administration of an agonistic foundation set up by a certain Charilaos. Glaukos used this sum to cover several expenses connected with the festival, which included a thymelic contest: he spent 2,070 drachmas for the purchase of the gold with which the crowns given to the competitors as first prizes were made; 400 drachmas for the second prizes (sums of money); 46 drachmas for the salary of the goldsmith who had made the crowns, 230 drachmas for the costume maker, 190 for the choirs, and 40 for the *auletai*; finally, he spent 300 drachmas for the sacrifices to Isis, Serapis and the other gods, and for the attached banquet, according to the foundation decree of the festival⁵⁰. Glaukos spent in total 3,276 drachmas, a little more than the sum he had at his disposal for the ordinary costs of the festival: he will have paid the difference (276 drachmas) out of his own pocket, even though this is not specified in the inscription. Moreover, we learn from his account that Glaukos returned 140 drachmas to the commission, a surplus sum originally destined for second prizes which had never been assigned⁵¹. Furthermore, in addition to using the 3,000 drachmas received by the civic

⁴⁶ See *infra*.

⁴⁷ Our knowledge of this institution has greatly increased since the publication of the inscription concerning the agonistic foundation set up by C. Iulius Demosthenes at Oinoanda, in Lycia, for the creation and celebration of the festival of the *Demostheneia* (Wörrle 1988). On foundations in general see note 43.

⁴⁸ Cf. H. W. Pleket, *Olympic Benefactors*, ZPE 20 (1976) 1–4. On the financing of festivals (in the Hellenistic cities) see most recently Migeotte 2010.

⁴⁹ Calvet, Roesch 1966; cf. Fröhlich 2004, 498–505; Migeotte 2006, 22; Migeotte 2010, 135–137.

⁵⁰ Calvet, Roesch 1966, 298–300, ll. 21–49.

⁵¹ Calvet, Roesch 1966, 300 (ll. 49–52 and 71–72).

commission (and funding the deficit of 276 drachmas), Glaukos covered entirely out of his own pocket other expenses connected to the festival: he paid for sacrificial victims and libations, as well as for the daily banquets offered to judges, artists, choirs and winners⁵².

3. The financing of festivals in the cities of Roman Greece

3.1. Public funding

Considering that religious festivals and *agones* represented a fundamental aspect of civic life in Greek communities, it can almost be taken for granted that public funds were allocated to finance these events as well as related activities. This statement is confirmed also indirectly, or ‘in negative’, through the occurrence in inscriptions of expressions such as “at one’s own expense“ with reference to the holding of civic charges connected with the realm of festivals and games: the specification that an official had covered, in part or entirely, the costs of a charge out of his own pocket means that, at least in theory, public money was usually expected to fund that charge⁵³. Notwithstanding this fact, direct and explicit references to the allocation and use of public funds for festivals and similar activities are, at least for the period in question, quite limited, and amount to a few cases such as an Athenian inscription of the 2nd c. B.C. that mentions funds (*prosodoi*) allocated for the Panathenaic festival⁵⁴. Indeed, it is worth noting that in most cases reference is made not to proper public subsidies but to ‘sacred’ funds, that is to revenues belonging to a sanctuary. Some financial accounts of Boeotian federal festivals show that the latter were financed through the revenues of the sanctuary where they were held. At Lebadea, Xenarchos, the *agonothetes* of the *Basileia*, had at his disposal 260 Aeginetic (bronze) drachmas plus 198 Attic drachmas. While the latter sum was a remnant from the budget of the former *agonothetes*, originally reserved for winners of horse races that had never

⁵² Calvet, Roesch 1966, 300, ll. 53–56. The exact sums Glaukos had spent are not specified in the inscription: as they regard extraordinary expenses, he was not obliged to specify them in his account.

⁵³ See e.g. *IThesp* 405 (Thespies; 1st c. B.C.): L. Fufius Rufus contributed money towards the costs of both the *Erotideia kai Kaisareia* and the *Mouseia*; *IG VII* 2712, ll. 56–59: in the age of the emperor Claudius, Epameinondas of Akraiphia refounded at his own expense the festival of the *Ptoia*, which had not taken place for thirty years due to economic problems (evidently due to the lack of public funds); *IvO* 940 (Elis; first half of the 2nd c. A.D.): honorary inscription for the gymnasiarch Ti. Claudius Artemas, who held the gymnasiarchy at his own expense (cf. *RP I*, EL 139). See Zoumbaki 2001, 100 and *infra* for more examples of private munificence.

⁵⁴ *IG II²* 968, ll. 42–44: [κ]αὶ τῶν μὲν ἀποτεταγμένων προσόδων μὴ συνεκποιουσῶν, ἐλλειπόντων δὲ πλείονων χρημ[άτων]. As regards in particular the *Panathenaia*, in classical Athens the existence of large-scale public funding is attested by the presence of functionaries called *athlothetai*, who regularly received public funds to administer this festival; see *IG I³* 370, ll. 66–67 (415/4 B.C.); 375, ll. 5–7 (410/9 B.C.); 378, fr. C, l. 14 (406/5 B.C.) and cf. P. Wilson, *Costing the Dionysia*, in: M. Revermann, P. Wilson (eds.), *Performance, iconography, reception: studies in honour of Oliver Taplin*, Cambridge 2008, 90 (with n. 8). See also *infra*, n. 119.

taken place, the 260 Aeginetic drachmas were revenues deriving from the lease of the hippodrome — more precisely the horses-enclosure (*hippaphesis*) — and the stadium (with the surrounding area), both of which belonged to the sanctuary of Zeus *Basileus*. In addition to these revenues, Xenarchos could also have counted on the contribution (*eisphora*) which the cities of the Boeotian *koinon* usually had to pay in order to subsidize the federal *Lebadeia*; however, the *agonothetes* himself declared that he had exempted all of the cities from the payment of this *eisphora*⁵⁵. The *Pamboiotia* — the proper national festival of the Boeotian *ethnos* and *koinon* — were also financed through sacred funds, as we learn from the accounts (*apologia*) of Nikarchos, a secretary of the Boeotian federal board of the *naopoioi*, who was in charge of the administration of the federal sanctuary of Athena *Ithonia* at Coronea as well as the management of the festival⁵⁶. In addition to the lease of the hippodrome (maybe the *hippaphesis* in this case also), which yielded 250 denarii, other revenues consisted in a tax of 437.5 denarii on the provisional booths used by itinerant merchants and sellers, levied as a due for the occupation of public soil; a wine tax of 200 denarii; a sum deriving from the lease and exploitation of lands sacred to Athena *Ithonia* (a tithe of 40 denarii on barley; 100 denarii deriving from a tithe on corn and the lease of a field)⁵⁷. Another pan-Boeotic festival, the already mentioned *Delia*, was financed through the lending of sums of money belonging to the sanctuary of Apollo, in the territory of Tanagra, to the organizing Boeotian cities, which in their turn paid back an annual interest to the sanctuary, thus undertaking a sort of annual contribution to the financial backing of the costs of this festival⁵⁸. Other examples of funding of festivals through sacred funds from other areas of the Greek peninsula can also be mentioned. The *hieros nomos* of Gythium, in southern Laconia, concerning the celebration of the *Kaisareia*, informs us that this festival, which included theatrical performances, was financed with *hiera chremata*. The magistrate in charge of the administration of these funds and of the payment of the artists — as well as of the general organization of the *Kaisareia* — was the *agoranomos*, who at the end of the festival had to submit an account before the assembly. If he were found guilty of embezzlement, he would have his possessions confiscated and used for the purchase of additional theatrical ornaments (*προσκοσμήματα*)⁵⁹. Public funds of a sacred nature were probably used to cover, at least in part, the costs of the organization of the *Asclepieia* at Epidaurus as well. In the latter *polis* a board of four *hieromnemes* had financial duties in

⁵⁵ IG VII 3078 (*Nouveau choix d'inscriptions grecques*, Paris 1971, 118–125, n° 22), A, ll. 20–24. Date: ca. 80–50 B.C. (cf. Fröhlich 2004, 546–548). See Fröhlich 2004, 472–483; Migeotte 2006, 16 and 22; Migeotte 2010, 137–138.

⁵⁶ D. Knoepfler, *L'intitulé oublié d'un compte des naopes béotiens*, in: D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux*, Genève 1988, 266 (ca. A.D. 100).

⁵⁷ Knoepfler, *Naopes* (cf. n. 56) 266 and 287–294; cf. Fröhlich 2004, 484; Migeotte 2006, 16–17 and 23.

⁵⁸ Cf. Brélaz, Andreiomenou, Ducrey, *Comptes* (cf. n. 30) 275–276.

⁵⁹ SEG 11, 1954, 923 (A.D. 15), ll. 12–17.

connection with the sanctuary of Asclepius. Officials called *hieromnemes* are attested in various Greek cities, where they were involved in the administration of sanctuaries; their tasks often had to do with financial matters: they administered the sacred properties and treasure, in addition to collecting taxes and fines. They could also take charge of the execution of honorary decrees, as long as the costs were covered by the funds administered by the *hieromnemes* (*hieromnemonikoi poroi*), as attested at Epidauros by the dedicatory inscription of an honorary monument for the Emperor Septimius Severus, his son Caracalla and his wife Iulia Domna, which was set up ἐκ τῶν ἱερομνημονικῶν πόρων⁶⁰. Thus, it can be assumed that at least part of the funds administered by the *hieromnemes* at Epidauros was intended to fund the celebration of the pentaeteric festival in honour of the god Asclepius⁶¹.

Generally speaking, the revenues of a sanctuary usually derived from the lease and/or exploitation of sacred properties⁶², taxes and duties of various kinds, fines, public subscriptions, foundations and donations. A sanctuary could also be assigned some revenues following the authoritative decision of an external power, as shown by the *senatus consultum* of 73 B.C. on the controversy between the Roman publicans and the *polis* of Oropos at the borders between Attica and Boeotia⁶³. After defeating Mithridates' armies at Chaeronea and Orchomenos, the Roman general Sulla granted a portion (1,000 feet) of the territory (*chora*) of the *polis* of Oropos to the sanctuary of Amphiaraos, declaring this portion to be inviolable (*asylos*). Furthermore, he stated that from that moment on, all of the revenues (*prosodoi*) deriving from the *polis*, its *chora* and harbours — i.e. the *vectigalia* formerly exacted by the Roman *publicani* — would be used to finance the celebration of the *agones* and the sacrifices for the god Amphiaraos, as well as those that the Oropians would perform in the future in honour of the Romans⁶⁴. The funds of a sanctuary could also be filled out thanks to individual acts of munificence. Xenarchos, for example, the *agonothetes* of the *Basileia* of Lebadea, gave proof of great generosity, as instead of using the (sacred) funds at his disposal, he paid for all the costs of the festival out of his own pocket, except for a not

⁶⁰ *IG* IV² 610; cf. H. Hepding, *Hieromnemes*, *RE* 8, 2 (1913) 1490–1496 (esp. 1491–1492 for Epidauros).

⁶¹ At Argos, around 100 B.C., Augis son of Aristomedes was honoured, among other things, for lending (without interest) 10,000 drachmas to the *hieromnemes* and the *tamias* for the *agon* of the *Titeia*; cf. Migeotte 1984, 84, n° 20 (ll. 13–15).

⁶² See e.g. the accounts of the Boeotian festivals of the *Basileia*, *Pamboiotia* and *Delia*; see also Bizard, *Ptoion* (cf. n. 31) 251–252 (accounts of an *agonothetes* of the *Ptoia* of Akraiphia) at ll. 39–41: ἀπὸ τῶν κυπα[ρ]ίττων ἔλαβον πεντακοσ[ί]α; the sale of cypresses must have been a source of revenue for the sanctuary of Apollo *Ptoios*.

⁶³ *IG* VII 413; R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore 1969, n° 23; B. Petrakos, *Οἱ ἐπιγραφές τοῦ Ὀρωποῦ*, Athens 1997, n° 308.

⁶⁴ Petrakos, *Oropos* (cf. n. 63) n° 308, ll. 42–49. The introduction of the new festival of the *Rhomaia* attached to the traditional *Amphiaraia* can be connected to the privileges granted by Sulla to the *Amphiaraion*; cf. Petrakos, *Oropos* (op. cit.) n° 521, a catalogue of victors at the first celebration of the *Amphiaraia kai Rhomaia*, dated to ca. 85 B.C.

specified, but presumably low sum of money he spent to dedicate a *phiale* to Zeus *Basileus*⁶⁵.

These examples show that a sanctuary's revenues (i.e. 'sacred funds') were used to cover, at least partially, the costs involved in the organization and celebration of religious festivals, and this must hold true, in my opinion, even in those cases for which we lack direct information. At Delphi, for example, a part of the funds of the sanctuary of Apollo must have been used to cope with the expenses connected with the celebration of the Pythian games, as the organization of the *Pythia* can be considered to be, as F. Lefèvre has underlined, "la plus prestigieuse des tâches de l'Amphictionie": some funds must certainly have been provided for this scope⁶⁶. With regard to this, it is worth noting that the *hieromnemes*, who were in charge of all of the main aspects of the *Pythia*, were also, in the Hellenistic period, the chief responsible for the financial administration of the Amphictiony (they also collected a special tax, called "tithe of the *Pythia*", whose exact nature is not known)⁶⁷. By the imperial period a newly introduced functionary, the *epimeletes*, had become the administrator of the *hiera chremata*⁶⁸; together with the *agonothetai* of the *Pythia*, the *epimeletai* also took care of some of the tasks concerning the organization of the festival⁶⁹.

On the other hand, one has to consider that as far as a sanctuary depended on a city (or *koinon*), its funds, although formally distinct from public funds, also depended on that city (or *koinon*), and were usually administered by civic (or federal) officials according to rules fixed by the city (or *koinon*) itself. Cities resorted to sacred funds especially for expenses linked to cultic activities, such as religious festivals⁷⁰. In their turn, sanctuaries used to receive funds from the city on which they depended, and those funds from that moment on came to be considered as sacred funds. In independent Delos, for example, funds were regularly allocated by the city, following a decision of the assembly, to the sanctuary of Apollo in order to cover several expenses, among which were those for the organization of the *Thesmophoria*, *Posideia* and *Eileithyaia*, and for the prizes in the athletic contests of the *Apollonia*⁷¹. The expenses covered with these funds according to laws and decrees (τὰ κατὰ νόμους

⁶⁵ *Nouveau choix* (cf. n. 55) n° 22, A, ll. 24–31.

⁶⁶ F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions*, Athènes 1998, 237.

⁶⁷ *CID* II 125 (3rd c. B.C.), l. 8: τὰ ἐκ τῶν Πυθίων ἐπιδέ[κτα]. See J. Bousquet's definition of this special tax in *CID* II, p. 270: "une source de revenus encore inconnue"; cf. also Lefèvre, *Amphictionie* (cf. n. 66) 239.

⁶⁸ Cf. *CID* IV 165. The *epimeletes* controlled "the interests and revenues" (*CID* IV 140, ll. 7–8: ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Πυθίου Ἀπόλλωνος τόκων καὶ προσόδων) and had to submit an account of his administration (*CID* IV 165).

⁶⁹ Cf. Lefèvre, *Amphictionie* (cf. n. 66) 237–239, 257–260.

⁷⁰ Cf. Migeotte 1984, 4, and idem, *Finances publiques* (cf. n. 45) 15 (with further bibliography at n. 17); sacred funds could also be used for secular activities, in that case usually in the form of refundable loans.

⁷¹ *ID* 440 A, ll. 45 (*Posideia* and *Eileithyaia*) and 55 (*Apollonia*); V. Chankowsky, *Le compte des hiéropes de 174 et l'administration du sanctuaire d'Apollon à la fin de l'indépendance délienne*, *BCH* 122 (1998) 219, l. 2 (*Thesmophoria*) and 223, ll. 81–82 (*Posideia*).

καὶ ψηφίσματα) were distinct from the ‘monthly’ (τὰ κατὰ μῆνα) expenses, for which some ordinary funds were used. Both the latter and the funds for the expenses approved “according to laws and decrees” were managed by the *hieropoioi* and were considered to be part of the ‘sacred chest’ of the sanctuary⁷².

Another interesting case of public funding of a festival is provided by the already mentioned Mysteries of Andania in Messenia. In addition to cultic dispositions, the sacred regulation concerning this festival also contains a paragraph on its financial administration⁷³. We learn from it that the city of Messene assumed the expenses of the reform by allocating funds for the restoration of some buildings⁷⁴ in the *Carneiasion* (sanctuary of Apollo *Carneios*) and for the funding of the first celebration of the reformed festival⁷⁵. A specific board of five members (the Five) was appointed, charged with the management of the funds allocated by the *polis* and of the revenues of the festival; the latter consisted mainly of taxes (‘purification taxes’; tax paid by the *mystai*) and fines. At the end of the Mysteries, the Five had to make an account before the *synedroi* (city councillors)⁷⁶. The city of Messene therefore took care of the funding of the building works in the *Carneiasion* and of the first celebration of the festival. However, according to the Messenian authorities — who devised the regulation — the Five would have been able, by means of the revenues that they had received during the festival, to reimburse the city for the entire sum allocated for the building works and for the celebration of the Mysteries; a surplus was also expected on the revenues of the festival, to be used to continue the works at the sanctuary⁷⁷. The paragraph in question ends with a clause stating that “once the sum which is required for the celebration of the Mysteries has been spent, the sums coming from the Mysteries shall become part of the revenues of the city”⁷⁸. It appears, therefore, that for the future the Messenian authorities expected the revenues of each celebration of the festival to be sufficient to ensure, on a regular basis, both the

⁷² Chankowsky, *Hiéropes* (cf. n. 71) 232–233; cf. Migeotte 2010, 127–130.

⁷³ *IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 45–64. Although this section of the *diagramma* refers specifically to the funding of the reform of the Mysteries which took place probably in 92/1 or 91/0 B.C. (but see *supra*, n. 17, for a lower chronology), it provides useful information on the system of financing to be adopted in the following celebrations of the festival as well.

⁷⁴ The Temple of the *Megaloi Theoi*, an *oikos* and the theatre. In addition to the repairs to these three buildings, two *thesouroi* were also built (*IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 89–92); cf. Deshours 2006, 88–89.

⁷⁵ *IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 53–55.

⁷⁶ *IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 45–52.

⁷⁷ *IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 52–56. The Five are also expected to pay to Mnasistratos 6,000 drachmas for the “crown” offered by the city (*IG V 1*, 1390, l. 53); the term *stephanos* may be used here in its proper sense, referring to a priestly emblem or maybe to the crown that was to adorn the *agalma* of Hagna, the goddess of the sacred spring located in the area of the sanctuary, but it may also indicate a sum of money given to Mnasistratos as a reward for his role in the reform of the Mysteries; cf. Deshours 2006, 76. In general, for the use of *stephanos* as a sum of money from Hellenistic times onwards see most recently S. Privitera, *Demostene, Diodoro e gli stephanoi-tributi dell’età ellenistica*, RIN 105 (2005) 47–50.

⁷⁸ *IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 63–64.

funding of the festival and even a surplus revenue (given that the revenues of the first year were expected to reimburse the city for the expenses, not only of the festival, but also of the building works in the sanctuary)⁷⁹. In return for an initial ‘investment’, Messene regarded the Mysteries as a source of revenues for its finances. This is in line with what I have said above about the economic implications of festivals and games, and it is confirmed by what is known about another Peloponnesian mystery festival, which took place at the sanctuary of Despoina at Lykosoura, in Arcadia. In the 1st c. A.D. Megalopolis, the city on which the sanctuary depended, had to resort to the liberality of a local benefactor, a certain Nikasippos — who accepted the priesthood of Despoina and paid the taxes owed to the Roman *fiscus* out of his own pocket — since the Mysteries of Lykosoura, which evidently represented a substantial source of revenues for Megalopolis, had yielded nothing that year due to the concurrence of the Olympic games⁸⁰.

What emerges from the evidence, therefore, is the close interconnection and interdependency between public and sacred funds, which perfectly reflects the close interconnection between a Greek city, its sanctuaries and its religious festivals. What is worth underlining, in any case, is that ‘public’ funds (be they in the form of proper public subsidies, or money belonging to a sanctuary’s treasury, or revenues deriving from the properties of a sanctuary) must have been quite regularly used to cover the expenses connected with the celebration and organization of festivals and similar activities, although this is only referred to explicitly in a relatively limited number of cases in our extant sources⁸¹.

3.2. (Agonistic) foundations

Public funds for the organization and celebration of games are also attested at Sparta, in connection with the festival of the *Kaisareia kai Eurycleia*. In the third century, the public budget of the *polis* of Sparta still provided “agonothetic funds“ for the celebration of this combined festival. Although public, these funds most likely

⁷⁹ For the first year, however, the possibility was taken into account that the city would have had to contribute more money to the restoration in the *Carneiasion* (*IG V 1*, 1390, ll. 56–57). Cf. Deshours 2006, 84–86.

⁸⁰ *IG V 2*, 516, ll. 12–16; cf. M. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes d’Arcadie*, Paris 1985, 331–332. This honorary decree was dated by A. Wilhelm (*Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, 153–157) to A.D. 42, based on the mention of the 32nd year of an era (ll. 4–5: ἔτους λ’ καὶ β’ κατὰ τὸν Σεβαστόν) which Wilhelm identified with the era starting in A.D. 10/11, attested in Arcadia. According to A. J. Gossage, *The Date of IG V 2, 516*, *BSA* 49 (1954) 51–56, the era in question would be the Actian era, starting in 31/30 B.C., and the inscription, therefore, should be dated to A.D. 1–2 (cf. *Bull. ép* 1956, 50).

⁸¹ The theme of the relationship between public and sacred funds is inevitably ‘embedded’ in the broader theme of the relationship between sanctuaries and cities, which goes beyond the scope of the present paper and cannot be dealt with here in detail; see most recently B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford 2002 (with further bibliography), who argues for the independence of sanctuaries from cities, with the objections by Th. Corsten, *CW* 99.2 (2006) 189–190 (190: “... some sanctuaries might have been truly independent of any other power, but this was hardly a general rule“).

included (or even originated from) the revenues of at least one agonistic foundation set up by a local benefactor. It cannot be excluded, however, that these "agonothetic funds" included public revenues of a different provenience as well. Let us consider the evidence.

In the 3rd c. A.D. M. Aurelius Cleomenes son of Nikephoros, *agathos* and *philopatris*, *agonothetes* of the *megala Kaisareia kai Eurycleia*, was honoured for giving back to the *polis* the entire surplus of the "agonothetic funds" (ἀγωνοθετικὰ χρήματα), at the same time providing that the statues and images of the victors were set up within the legally fixed term⁸². Although their earliest attestation dates to the Flavian age⁸³, the Spartan *Kaisareia* were likely founded in the age of Augustus, and the responsibility for their institution in all probability lies with the same C. Iulius Eurycles — 'friend' of Augustus, from whom he received the *civitas* and the recognition of a personal *dynasteia* over the Spartans — who was also instigator of the introduction of the emperor cult in the Lacedaemonian city at the beginning of the Principate⁸⁴. Eurycles must have provided financially for the institution of the new imperial festival (*Kaisareia*), in the context of the creation of a cult of Augustus at Sparta, probably also setting up an endowment in order to provide for the celebration of the festival in the following years. The refurbishment of the theatre of Sparta during the reign of Augustus may be connected with the creation of the *Kaisareia*, and Eurycles probably contributed money towards the works in the theatre⁸⁵. If Eurycles set up an endowment for the *Kaisareia*, as seems likely, part of the "agonothetic funds" mentioned in the honorary inscription for the *agonothetes* M. Aurelius Cleomenes may have consisted of the revenues of that endowment⁸⁶. As for the *Eurycleia*, they were named after Eurycles' descendant C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanus, the first Spartan to enter the Roman Senate, who was active during the reigns of

⁸² *IG V 1*, 550 (first or second half of the 3rd c. A.D.); see *RP II*, LAC 119. Agonothetic funds are perhaps mentioned in a letter of the emperor Hadrian to the *polis* of Delphi dated to A.D. 125 (*CID IV* 152, ll. 11–12: Τὰ τῶν [ἀγωνοθεσιῶν ? χρήματα]): these funds were used for some distributions (*dianomai*); cf. *CID IV*, p. 361.

⁸³ L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*, Roma 1953, n° 86.

⁸⁴ Strab. 8, 5, 5 (C 366); G. W. Bowersock, *Eurycles of Sparta*, *JRS* 51 (1961) 112–118; Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 98–99, 184–185; *RP II*, LAC 461; on the Spartan Euryclids see most recently M. Kantiréa, *Les dieux et les dieux Augustes. Le culte impérial en Grèce sous les Julio-Claudiens et les Flaviens. Études épigraphiques et archéologiques*, Athènes 2007, 159–166 and J.-S. Balzat, *Les Euryclides en Laconie*, in: C. Grandjean (ed.), *Le Péloponnèse d'Épaminondas à Hadrien (Colloque de Tours, 6–7 octobre 2005)*, Bordeaux 2008, 335–350 (with further bibliography at n. 2); see also Camia, Kantiréa, *Imperial Cult* (cf. n. 16), 390–391, and G. Steinhauer, *C. Iulius Eurycles and the Spartan dynasty of the Euryclids*, in: *RP III*, 75–87. The presence of the imperial cult at Sparta in the Augustan age is attested by a passage of Pausanias (3, 11, 4) referring to *naoi* of Caesar and Augustus in the agora of the city.

⁸⁵ If this is the case, the programme of the newly created imperial festival will have included dramatic contests; only athletic contests are attested in the inscriptions; cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 128–129, 135, 185.

⁸⁶ But see *infra*.

Trajan and Hadrian⁸⁷. On his death, about A.D. 136, Herculanius left some properties to his own city; in the year A.D. 136/7 a civic official called *πράκτωρ τῶν ἀπὸ Εὐρυκλέους* is first attested at Sparta: he must have been in charge of the administration of Herculanius' bequest to his own city⁸⁸. The revenues, or, more likely, some of the revenues of this bequest were to be used to endow a new pentaeteric festival in honour of Herculanius, the *Eurycleia*. This can be inferred from a catalogue of ephors — dated by the patronimate of Neikephoros son of Marcus to A.D. 136/7, i.e. immediately after Herculanius' death — in which the first celebration of the *Eurycleia* is recorded together with the donation of the island of Cythera to Sparta by the Emperor Hadrian⁸⁹. Both these events are most likely connected with Herculanius' will. In addition to leaving some of his properties to Sparta, Herculanius, following the common practice among the Roman aristocracy of including the emperor in wills, will have bequeathed his own family's estates on the island of Cythera to the emperor, who in turn gave them back to Sparta, together with the entire island⁹⁰. After Hadrian's gift, therefore, the revenues from the island will have increased Herculanius' bequest to Sparta. Moreover, according to a suggestion by Spawforth, the thermal complex found west of the theatre of Sparta should be identified with the gymnasium of Eurycles mentioned by Pausanias, "the donor to be understood as the opulent Eurycles Herculanius"; this gift may have been part of Herculanius' bequest, and it can be connected with the introduction of the *Eurycleia*⁹¹.

In light of the previous considerations we can argue that the "agonothetic funds" referred to in the above-mentioned honorary inscription for the *agonothetes* of the *Kaisareia kai Eurycleia*, M. Aurelius Cleomenes, most likely included the revenues of Herculanius' endowment for the *Eurycleia*, and maybe also those of the endowment that Herculanius' ancestor, C. Iulius Eurycles, had likely set up on the occasion of the institution of the *Kaisareia* (unless these endowments had run out by this time). We can imagine, therefore, a similar situation for both festivals (*Kaisareia* and *Eurycleia*): a local benefactor creates a new festival, and in order to secure its funding he sets up an endowment, administered by civic functionaries⁹².

This is what probably happened also at Epidaurus, when Cn. Cornelius Nicatas, twice priest of Augustus and *agonothetes* of the *Apolloniaia kai Asclepieia*, founded an imperial festival, the *Kaisareia*, and held for the first time the presidency of the

⁸⁷ Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 110–112; *RP II*, LAC 462.

⁸⁸ *SEG* 11, 1950, 494, ll. 2–3 (Nikaron son of Zelon); cf. Steinhauer (s. n. 89) 202. His charge as *praktor* is dated by the patronimate of (C. Iulius) Neikephorus (see following note).

⁸⁹ G. Steinhauer, *The Euryklids and Kythera*, *Mediterranean Archaeology* 19–20 (2006–2007) 199–206 (esp. 199–200 for the individual, whose full name was C. Iulius Neikephorus — see also *RP II*, LAC 483 —, and 201 for the dating of his patronimate).

⁹⁰ A. Hupfloher, *Kulte im kaiserzeitlichen Sparta. Eine Rekonstruktion anhand der Priesterämter*, Berlin 2000, 169, n. 86; Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 110–111; *RP II*, LAC 462.

⁹¹ Paus. 3, 14, 6; cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 111, 129–130.

⁹² In the case of Herculanius, we have a bequest, which was probably used for other things in addition to the funding of the new festival of the *Eurycleia*.

games⁹³: it is likely that Nicatas, in addition to assuming the expenses of the first celebration of the new festival, also allocated a sum to secure the celebration of the festival in the future.

To return to Sparta, some time after Herculanus' bequest, the *Kaisareia* and *Eurycleia* began to be celebrated successively in the same year. A. J. S. Spawforth has supposed that "the reasons for this association may have been financial, perhaps so as to allow the more recent endowment bequeathed by Herculanus to subsidize the (by now depleted?) funds given by his ancestor for the older festival"⁹⁴. If this is the case, Eurycles' endowment may have run out by the middle of the 2nd c. A.D. In fact, although foundations were often supposed to be eternal, at least in the intention of their authors, they could be affected both by bad administration and by the uncertainties of the market (e.g. debasement of currency⁹⁵).

Modifications to an already existing foundation are attested by a fragmentary inscription from Eleusis dated to the second half of the 2nd c. A.D. It consists of a decree — to which an extract of a declaration of a *praefectus* named Severus is attached — probably voted by the *synedrion* of the *Panhellenes*, which concerns a foundation originally set up in order to favour the financial administration of the sanctuary of the Two Gods, and particularly the celebration of the Mysteries. Among other matters, which remain obscure due to the fragmentary nature of the text, the latter contains provisions for the use of a surplus deriving from the original foundation to make distributions to the members of the Athenian *boule* and to priests and other cultic personnel of the sanctuary of Eleusis. The author of the original donation, which was administered by the *hierophantes* and the *dadouchos*, is probably to be identified with T. Flavius Xenion of Marathon, archon of the *Panhellenion* in the years A.D. 165–169, who some years later left some funds in his will for the celebration of birthday ceremonies for members of his own family and the imperial family in his hometown of Gortyn (Crete)⁹⁶.

⁹³ *IG* IV² 652; cf. *RP* I, ARG 114.

⁹⁴ Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 187.

⁹⁵ Endowments consisting of sums of money were often invested in land (cf. Jones, *The Greek City* [cf. n. 45] 246).

⁹⁶ Eleusinian endowment: *I.Eleusis* 489 (A.D. 169/70?) with commentary by Clinton; contra J. H. Oliver, *The Eleusinian Endowment*, *Hesperia* 21 (1952) 381–399 and idem, *The Ruling Power. A Study of the Roman Empire in the second century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides* (TAPhS n.s. 43.4), Philadelphia 1953, 966–968, dated the original foundation to the late Hadrianic age (yet, as noted by Clinton, *I.Eleusis*, vol. II, p. 369, the present document could date to just a few years after the original donation) and assigned the decree to the Areopagus. Xenion's archonship: *I.Eleusis* 491; cf. Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius* (cf. n. 38), 133; S. Follet, *Athènes au I^{er} et au III^e siècle. Études chronologiques et prosopographiques*, Paris 1976, 127; on the *Panhellenion* see A. J. S. Spawforth, S. Walker, *The world of the Panhellenion I. Athens and Eleusis*, *JRS* 75 (1985) 78–104; C. P. Jones, *The Panhellenion*, *Chiron* 26 (1996) 29–56; A. J. S. Spawforth, *The Panhellenion Again*, *Chiron* 29 (1999) 339–352. Xenion's bequest in Gortyn: *IC* IV 300 (ca. A.D. 177–182; cf. Oliver, *Endowment* [op. cit.] 397–399). The *praefectus* Severus cannot be identified with certainty: two possible candidates are C. Iulius Severus, proconsul of Achaia in ca. A.D. 133 and *praefectus*

In some cases an agonistic foundation could be set up to resume a festival (or one of its events) which was no longer being regularly celebrated due to the lack of public funds. This is what happened a little before the middle of the 1st c. B.C. at Pagai, in the Megaris. Soteles son of Kallinikos was honoured for giving the city 1,200 Alexandrine drachmas; the interest on this sum was to be used to finance the yearly celebration of the pyrrhic — a traditional dance in armour with musical accompaniment performed during the festival of the *Soteria* — whose realization in many cases was prevented by the absence of adequate funds⁹⁷. Another Megarian Hellenistic inscription attests to the institution of a foundation intended to fill out the funds allocated for the celebration of an *agon* and sacrifices addressed to a certain Poseidonios. In this case the author of the donation is a woman, Arete daughter of Aristandros. After buying a portion of a *kepos* located near the sea from the *koinon* of the *Aigosthenitai* for 1,000 drachmas, she consecrated to Poseidonios and the *koinon* itself a *temenos*, called *Poseidonion*. From the revenues (*phoros*) of this *temenos*, which was evidently rented out, the members of the *koinon* were required to enlarge the endowment (*argyron*) allocated for the costs of the celebration of an *agon* and sacrifices for Poseidonios, so as to make them more splendid⁹⁸.

A ruler could also set up an agonistic foundation. At the end of the 3rd c. B.C., on the occasion of the reorganization of the festival of the *Mouseia*, Ptolemaios IV and Arsinoe III donated a sum of money to Thespies, which was reinvested by the Boeotian city in some estates. The revenues derived from the lease of these lands will have been used to pay for the prizes assigned to competitors in the dramatic contests of the *Mouseia*⁹⁹. Some years before, a private individual serving as *hiereus* of the Muses had consecrated 4,200 drachmas to the latter and the city in order to provide Thespies with an income to be used for the purchase of the oxen to be sacrificed

aerarii in ca. A.D. 137 (*PIR*² I 573; cf. Oliver, *Ruling Power* [op. cit.], 967–968; see also idem, *Augustan, Flavian, and Hadrianic Praefecti Iure Dicundo in Asia and Greece*, *AJPh* 84 [1963] 165) and Cn. Claudius Severus (*PIR*² C 1024), as suggested by Follet, *Athènes* (op. cit.) 127–128.

⁹⁷ A. Wilhelm, *Inscript aus Pagai*, *JÖAI* 10 (1907) 19–20 (67–59 B.C.), ll. 27–30; cf. Laum, *Stiftungen* (cf. n. 43) II, n° 22; Quass 1993, 285; P. Ceccarelli, *La pirrica nell'antichità greco romana. Studi sulla danza armata*, Roma 1998, 95–97.

⁹⁸ *IG VII 43* (3rd–2nd c. B.C.?; see J. von Protz, L. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae I–II*, Leipzig 1896–1906, II, 200). Although the question remains uncertain, it is perhaps preferable to refer the name Poseidonios to a man rather than to the god Poseidon, for whom the form Ποσειδώνιος is never attested; furthermore, as far as I know, the form Ποσειδώνιον is never attested to indicate a sanctuary of the god Poseidon, but always as the accusative case of the personal name Ποσειδώνιος, which is attested at Megara twice, in both cases in the second half of the 2nd c. B.C. (*LGPN* III.B, s.v. *Poseidonios*). Cf Protz, Ziehen, *Leges* (op. cit.) II, 199–200, n° 64; Laum, *Stiftungen* (cf. n. 43) II, n° 21; I. Calero Secall, *La capacidad jurídica de las mujeres griegas en la época helenística. La epigrafía como fuente*, Málaga 2004, 14.

⁹⁹ *IThesp* 62 (ca. 210–204 B.C.). Between 277 and 263 B.C. Phileteros donated an estate "to the Muses and the *synthytaí* of Phileteros", a religious association in whose hands the administration of Phileteros' foundation lay; cf. P. Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, Paris 1982, 126–127, n° 6, and 165.

during the *Mouseia*¹⁰⁰. In 12 B.C. Herodes of Judea received the honorary title of perpetual *agonothetes* (διηνεκῆς ἀγωνοθέτης) from the Eleans, having set up an endowment for the Olympic games¹⁰¹. The title of *agonothetes* (of the Olympic games) was also bestowed three times on the Rhodian M. Cocceius Timasarchus¹⁰². As in the case of Herodes, Timasarchus, who was archon of the Panhellenion in the years A.D. 197–200, most likely received that title because of his financial support of the celebration of the Olympic festival. At Elis a regular office of president of the games did not exist, the title of *agonothetes* being sometimes bestowed as an honorary recognition of well-to-do and munificent foreign benefactors who had contributed money to the cost of the Olympic festival, as shown by the two examples just mentioned¹⁰³. Some of the tasks of the *agonothetes* — as well as of the financial burden that *agonothetai* usually sustained in Greek cities¹⁰⁴ — might have been assumed at Elis by the *alytarches*, a police officer charged with the control of good order in the sanctuary during the celebration of the games. It seems that by the third century A.D. this official had financial duties as well, judging from the recurrence of expressions such as δαψιλῆς φιλοτιμία and φιλοτεΐμως in honorary inscriptions for alytarchs set up by the Olympic *boule* and the *alytai*: those expressions point most likely to liturgies or voluntary financial service, some of which may have been performed in the context of the Olympic games¹⁰⁵.

The activities of the gymnasium — an institution connected with athleticism and *agones* — were sometimes funded through foundations as well. In the commercial harbour of Gythium, a woman named Phaenia Aromation — a rich *liberta* involved in the trade of perfumes — provided the oil for the local gymnasium by setting up a bequest; it was her intention that the interest from the sum she had bequeathed to the city should have ensured in perpetuity the provision of oil for those attending the gymnasium, both citizens of Gythium and foreigners¹⁰⁶. Endowment of the activities

¹⁰⁰ *IThesp* 54 (ca. 230–228 B.C.), ll. 24–28.

¹⁰¹ *Ios. ant. Iud.* 16, 149; *bell. Iud.* 1, 426–427.

¹⁰² G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Epigrafi rodie inedite*, PP 5 (1950) 76, n° 1.

¹⁰³ Pleket, *Benefactors* (cf. n. 48), 5–7; Zoumbaki 2001, 143–144.

¹⁰⁴ On *agonothetes*' tasks see *infra*.

¹⁰⁵ *IvO* 479, 483 (3rd c. A.D.); cf. Zoumbaki 2001, 147. The *Hellanodikai* were charged with the general administration of the games, but they do not seem to have had financial duties. As for the financial administration of the sanctuary of Zeus, the *epimeletes* was likely in charge of it, but this official seems to have had nothing to do with the games (this title never occurs in connection with the Olympic games). For benefactions by other Elean civic officials (*agoranomos*, gymnasiarch) in connection with the celebration of the Olympic festival see *infra*. See also, e.g., *IThesp* 361 (2nd c. A.D.): honorary inscription from Thespies for the philosopher Avidius Archestratus, who was *cheiliarchos*, *strategos*, gymnasiarch, *agoranomos* πλεονάκις φιλοτιμίας χάριν, in addition to serving as *agonothetes* of the *Mouseia*.

¹⁰⁶ *IG V.1*, 1208 (ll. 14–15); cf. K. Harter-Uibopuu, *The Trust Fund of Phaenia Aromation (IG V.1 1208) and Imperial Gytheion*, *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* vol. 5.A.4 (2004) [<http://www.ut.ee/klassik/sht/>]; A. D. Rizakis, *Les affranchi(es) sous l'Empire: richesse, evergétisme et promotion sociale*, in: V. I. Anastasiadis, P. N. Doukellis (eds.), *Esclavage antique et discriminations socio-culturelles (28^e colloque international, GIREA, Mytilène, 5–7 décembre*

of the gymnasium is also attested at Sparta, where this practice seems to have been quite frequent in the late 2nd and 3rd centuries, at least judging by the honorary title of permanent (*aionios*) gymnasiarch which occurs six times in inscriptions, being bestowed on those individuals who had endowed the office of gymnasiarch instead of actually holding it¹⁰⁷. An endowment for the gymnasiarchy was set up by the emperor Hadrian in Athens. Starting from the second half of the 2nd c. A.D. inscriptions mention an official called "epimeletes of the *gymnasiarchy* of the god Hadrian": he must have been in charge of a fund donated by the philhellene emperor to finance the activities of the Athenian gymnasia¹⁰⁸. Even after the introduction of this endowment, rich and ambitious men could still assume the office of gymnasiarch, yet in these cases they usually covered the resulting expenses out of their own pockets¹⁰⁹.

3.3. Private funding and euergetism

As we have seen, public and sacred funds were usually allocated to finance festivals and *agones*. Moreover, *ad hoc* foundations may in some cases have augmented civic funds, thus securing the celebration of festivals and games even for long periods of time. Notwithstanding this fact, and even though a religious festival itself usually represented a source of revenues for the organizing city — as the case of the Mysteries of Andania shows — public funds were not always adequate for the financing of such events. Cities therefore had to resort to the liberality of their citizens (private individuals and office-holders) or of well-to-do foreigners, and later also to the gifts of the emperors or of other representatives of the Roman state. The example of Messene, which used to assign the provision of the sacrificial victims for the Mysteries of Andania — as well as of the firewood for the heating of the baths of the sanctuary of Apollo *Carneios* where the Mysteries took place — to any (well-to-do) citizen who agreed to accomplish this task for the lowest price¹¹⁰, shows that even when public funds and/or the revenues coming from a festival secured its financing¹¹¹,

2003), Berne 2005, 233–241. The above mentioned C. Iulius Eurycles was honoured by the city of Asopos for having ensured the supply of oil εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (*IG V 1, 970*).

¹⁰⁷ *IG V 1, 468, 528–529, 535, 547, 552*. The same expression is attested for other Spartan civic liturgies (*sitionia*, hipparchy, agoranomate). Cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 158.

¹⁰⁸ *IG II² 1077, 2888, 3620, 3688; IG IV² 691*. Cf. *IG II² 1102* (A.D. 131/2): fragmentary epistle of Hadrian to the Athenians, announcing the donation of the gymnasium and a sum of money (ll. 11–14: τοῖς παισὶν ὑμῶν τοῖς [τε νέοις τὸ γυμνάσι]ον δίδωμι πρὸς τῷ κόσμῳ [γενέσθαι τῇ πόλει καὶ ... ca. 5... τ]άπαντα ἐπι[δίδωμι - - - εὐ]τυχεῖτε).

¹⁰⁹ *IG II² 3592, l. 6*: [γ]υ[μνα]σιαρχ[ήσαν]τος ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων; *IG II² 3687, ll. 25–26*: γυμνασιαρχήσαντος οἰκοθεν. Cf. Geagan 1967, 128–132.

¹¹⁰ *IG V 1, 1390, ll. 65–67, 108–109*; cf. Deshours 2006, 86–87. Apparently, Mnasistratos contributed no money to the city for the reform of the Mysteries, yet he was rewarded for his prominent role in the re-foundation of the Mysteries (he officially handed on to the *polis* the *hiera* his family had been keeping for years); Deshours 2006, 72–77.

¹¹¹ Deshours 2006, 75: "les Mystères doivent s'auto-financer, sinon la première année, du moins les suivantes".

the members of the elite were still called upon to play an important role in support of their cities.

Generally speaking, in the communities of the Roman Empire the munificence of the wealthy members of the elite — expressed through both formal or customary financial obligations (*summa honoraria* and liturgies) and other supplementary benefactions (i.e. proper acts of euergetism, which by strict definition should be spontaneous) — represented one of the most important items of civic finances, its weight greatly increasing over time¹¹². By the second century A.D., public euergetism — in its widest sense — had become a regular feature of civic life, i.e. of the functioning of civic institutions, representing an essential aspect of a city's institutional machinery¹¹³. This situation is reflected in the epigraphic habit of that epoch and in the honours publicly bestowed on the benefactors in order to encourage others to act like them.

The *poleis* of Greece were not exceptions to the general trend which saw, beginning particularly from the Late Hellenistic period and with growing intensity during the first two centuries of the Empire, the decisive role of notables in the organization and funding of civic activities (including festivals). As we have seen, this liberality sometimes took the form of an (agonistic) foundation, but in many other cases it consisted of services and benefactions of various kinds performed both by private individuals and office-holders.

3.3.1. Local benefactors

In Greek cities the official charged with the organization of a festival was the *agonothetes*. If the financing of a festival was made through public funds, in theory the *agonothetes* was not expected to contribute money to it. It seems, for example, that at the already mentioned *Demostheneia* at Oinoanda in Lycia most of the *agonothetes*' burden was organizational rather than financial, since the festival's funding was secured by Demosthenes' foundation. In practice, however, this charge quite invari-

¹¹² Duncan-Jones, *Structure and Scale* (cf. n. 44), 160: "town finance was essentially 'liturgical', with much or most cash revenue coming from a narrow tax-base of well-to-do office-holders".

¹¹³ On euergetism see P. Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*, Paris 1976; Ph. Gauthier, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions* (BCH Suppl. 12), Paris 1985; Sartre 1991, 147–166; G. Rogers, *The Gift and Society in Roman Asia: Orthodoxies and Heresies*, SCI 12 (1993) 188–199; L. Migeotte, *L'évergétisme des citoyens aux périodes classique et hellénistique*, in: M. Christol, O. Masson (eds.), *Actes du X^e congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine, Nîmes, 4–9 octobre 1992*, Paris 1997, 183–196 (esp. 191 ff. for its economic and financial role) and, most recently, A. Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire. Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 2009. For the imperial period see in particular W. Eck, *Der Euergetismus im Funktionszusammenhang der kaiserzeitlichen Städte*, in: Christol, Masson (eds.), *Actes du X^e congrès* (op. cit.) 305–331 (esp. 307–315 for the relationship between euergetism and civic finances); cf. also Quass 1993 (*passim*); Rizakis, *Urban Elites* (cf. n. 6).

ably amounted to an onerous liturgy; in particular, if the funding was not adequate, the *agonothetes* might end up contributing a large sum of money, for example by providing prizes¹¹⁴. As C. Roueché has put it, "in practice there was always a chance to spend ... and there are signs that the term (scil. *agonothetes*) became increasingly equated with simply putting on (and paying for) a contest"¹¹⁵.

As has already been mentioned, the *polis* of Athens allocated public funds for the celebration of the festival of the patron goddess of the city, the *Panathenaia*. The same must hold true for other festivals as well. Furthermore, after the abolition of the *choregia* at the end of the 4th c. B.C., individual *choregoi* — who before that reform were required to sustain the costs for the preparation of dramatic and dithyrambic choruses — were replaced by the collective *choregia* of the *demos*, which implied that in theory from that moment on it will have been up to the *polis* to cover the expenses of the *Dionysia* and the other dramatic festivals (*Lenaia*, *Thargelia*). As a matter of fact, however, the money allocated by the *polis* was not sufficient to pay for all of the involved expenses; as a consequence, in addition to taking charge of the practical aspects of the festivals, the newly introduced official of the *agonothetes* had to contribute money to their costs¹¹⁶. Thus we can say that although the reorganization of the Athenian *choregia* at the beginning of the Hellenistic age implies the existence of some public funds for civic festivals, in practice it was the individual *agonothetes* who was called on to sustain much of the financial burden at his own expense. For example, the famous Athenian of royal descent Philopappus was honoured as archon and *agonothetes* of the *Dionysia* by the tribe *Aiantis* for his *euergesia*, which certainly consisted in sustaining the festival's expenses¹¹⁷. The epigraphic and literary evidence for the liberal spending of the Athenian *agonothetai* also relates to other agonistic festivals of the city. The *agonothesia* of the *Panathenaia* (particularly the *Megala Panathenaia*) equated to a very onerous liturgy. Around the middle of the 2nd c. B.C. Miltiades of Marathon, as *agonothetes* of the Panathenaic festival, lent considerable

¹¹⁴ Dio of Prusa notes that a seeker of glory might "hire some Olympic victor for a fee of five talents" (= 30,000 drachmas) (Dion Chrys. *Or.* 66, 11; trans. by H. Lamar Crosby, Loeb).

¹¹⁵ Roueché, *Performers* (cf. n. 33) 8, and n. 65; cf. Mitchell 1990, 188; Quass 1993, 277–285, 310–315; Dmitriev, *City Government* (cf. n. 44) 144, n. 23; Bekker-Nielsen 2008, 74.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Quass 1993, 275–280; P. Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia. The Chorus, the City and the Stage*, Cambridge 2000, 270–276; L. O'Sullivan, *The Regime of Demetrius of Phalerum in Athens, 317–307 BCE*, Leiden, Boston 2009, 168–185; E. Csapo, P. Wilson, *Le passage de la chorégie à l'agonothésie à Athènes à la fin du IV^e siècle*, in: B. Le Guen (ed.), *L'argent dans les concours du monde grec. Actes du colloque international, Saint-Denis et Paris, 5–6 décembre 2008*, Paris 2010, 83–105.

¹¹⁷ *IG II² 3112* (end of the 1st c. A.D.). This inscription features a *choregos* named Boulon. In first century Athens there was an ephemeral revival of the traditional *phyle*-based *choregia*, attested by the reappearance of the choregic monuments and the title of *choregos* borne by single individuals; yet this did not change the substance of things, as in practice it was the *agonothetes* who sustained the costs of the festivals, as is well shown by the case of Philopappus. Plutarch may be referring to this same occasion as well when he reports that Philopappus "acted as *choregos* for all the tribes together" (*symp.* 1, 10, 1 [628A]). Cf. Geagan 1967, 137; Wilson, *Khoregia* (cf. n. 116), 276–278.

sums of money to his city without claiming the interest, in addition to assuming many expenses connected with the celebration of the festival out of his own pocket. Moreover, he financed building works on the Acropolis, in the *Odeion* and the *Anakeion*¹¹⁸. An individual's liberality and *philotimia* could reach very high levels, as in the case of the Athenian 'millionaire' Herodes Atticus, who during his four year term as *agonothetes* of the *Panathenaia* completed and paid for the rebuilding in marble of the Panathenaic stadium¹¹⁹. A series of honorary decrees for *agonothetai* of the *Theseia*, dated to the middle of the 2nd c. B.C., give further details on the variety of expenses connected with a festival and of the financial burden an *agonothetes* could be called upon to sustain. The *agonothetai* in question are honoured for organizing a well-ordered procession, for realizing the sacrifices to Theseus in the ancient manner, for taking care of the contestants in the *lampadedromia* and the athletic *agon*, for providing prizes for the winners; moreover, they made daily distributions of money to the *boule* and the *prytanies* and paid for the erection of a stele with the name of the winners, to be set up in the sanctuary of Theseus¹²⁰.

Many further examples of the munificence of the *agonothetai* can be found in other parts of Greece. At Argos, two *agonothetai* of the festival of the *Sebasteia kai Nemeia* are known to have performed several benefactions. In particular, they provided the gymnasium and the bath with oil for an entire day from dawn to sunset and offered a hecatomb to Zeus *Nemeios*¹²¹. Another Argive *agonothetes*, Ti. Iulius Regulus, donated a sum of money to the goddess Hera, his generosity being rewarded with a golden crown and a purple cloak¹²². Still at Argos, C. Claudius Tychicus, while holding the position of *eisagogeus* — basically an assistant of the *agonothetes* — of the *Heraia*, made a distribution of one denarium to every free-born citizen¹²³, while at

¹¹⁸ *IG* II² 968. Cf. Geagan 1967, 132–133; Migeotte 1984, 33, n° 6; Quass 1993, 280.

¹¹⁹ Philostr. *soph.* 550; cf. J. Tobin, *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens: Patronage and Conflict under the Antonines*, Amsterdam 1997, 162–173. As suggested by Geagan 1967, 136, it is possible that the *agonothetai* of the Panathenaic festival were assisted in their tasks by the *athlothetai*, who in classical Athens received public funds for the administration of the *Panathenaia* (see *supra*, n. 54 for the epigraphic references).

¹²⁰ *IG* II² 956–958. Cf. Geagan 1967, 132–133; Quass 1993, 280.

¹²¹ *IG* IV 606 (1st c. A.D.): honorary inscription for Ti. Claudius Diodotus, who was also *agoranomos*, *grammateus* and *hierophantes*; he is styled as hereditary (διὰ πάπων) *agonothetes*; cf. *RP* I, ARG 88. *IG* IV 602 (A.D. 116–117): honorary inscription for Ti. Claudius Tertius Flavianus; he also provided public banquets and distributions; cf. *RP* I, ARG 89.

¹²² *IG* IV 586 (1st c. A.D.), with the new integrations by S. Zoumbaki, *Στὰ ἴχνη ἐπιφανῶν Ἀργείων τῆς ρωμαϊκῆς ἐποχῆς. Παλαιές και νέες ἐπιγραφικές μαρτυρίες γιὰ μιὰ σημαντικὴ οἰκογένεια ἀπὸ τὸ Ἄργος*, in: *B' Πανελλήνιο Συνέδριο Ἐπιγραφικῆς, Θεσσαλονίκη 24–25 Νοεμβρίου 2001*, Thessaloniki 2008, 115–134, based on the epigraphic notes included in the diary of the learned English noble Francis Vernon (end of the 17th c.). The name of the festival of which Regulus was *agonothetes* is not preserved on the stone; Fraenkel integrated *Sebasteia*, but Zoumbaki (p. 122) prefers *Nemeia kai Heraia* (it is worth noting that Hera is the recipient of Regulus' gift). Cf. also *IG* IV 672 (Nauplion; 3rd c. A.D.): honorary inscription for the *agonothetes* M. Aurelius Rufus, who assumed several civic charges (*politeiai*) at his own expense; cf. *RP* I, ARG 53.

¹²³ *SEG* 35, 1985, 270–271 (2nd c. A.D.); cf. *RP* I, ARG 105.

Epidaurus an anonymous benefactor was honoured for giving 10,000 denarii "for the *agones* of the *Sebastoi*", in addition to donating 5,000 drachmas to the city¹²⁴. At Akraiphia, Aischriondas son of Praxilles, *agonothetes* of the *Ptoia*, offered sacrifices to the gods and banquets to his fellow citizens with liberality and splendour (ἐκτενωῶς δὲ καὶ λαμπρῶς)¹²⁵. At Thespies Lysandros son of Polycratides held the *agonothesia* of the *Erotideia Rhomaia* at his own expense, in addition to a priesthood¹²⁶. Ariston son of Phileinos was honoured by the *polis* and the *demos* of Thespies for holding several local offices in an excellent way and for twice assuming (evidently at his own expense) the *agonothesia* of the *Erotideia kai Kaisareia*, of the *Mouseia* and of the games in honour of Livia¹²⁷. At Hyampolis, in Phocis, an individual introduced some festivals (*Megala Kaisareia*, *Megala Elaphebolia*, *Laphria*) and held the post of *agonothetes* at his own expense¹²⁸.

As already noted, one of the most expensive items of agonistic festivals was the provision of prizes for victors. In the 3rd c. B.C. the Argive Eudoxos son of Eudoxos was honoured by the Amphictions as he had promised to realize at his own expense ten bronze-gilded shields for the foot race of the Pythia¹²⁹. At Sparta around A.D. 98 two local benefactors, C. Iulius Agesilaus, *patronomos* in about A.D. 100, and T. Flavius Charixenus, likely a kinsman of the former (perhaps his son-in-law), appear as first *athlothetai* ("prize-givers") of the newly founded *Oourania*¹³⁰, while probably late in the reign of Trajan, on the occasion of the reorganization of the already mentioned *Leonideia*, Agesilaus promised to give Sparta HS 42,000 to be used to provide (or increase) the prize-money in specific events; such a gift permitted the city to double the value of the cash prizes, which were apparently increased to HS 120,000¹³¹. Moreover, the famous Spartan benefactor and member of the Euryclids, C. Iulius Laco, who probably founded the local cult of Augustus' spouse Livia after her death

¹²⁴ *IG* IV² 27 (1st c. A.D. ?).

¹²⁵ *IG* VII 4148, ll. 3–5 (2nd–1st c. B.C.).

¹²⁶ *IThesp* 374 (1st–2nd c. A.D.). His father, Polycratides, was honoured by the Italians of Thespies because he built a gymnasium reserved for them, and set up a foundation to secure the provision of oil in perpetuity (*IThesp* 373).

¹²⁷ *IThesp* 376–377 (1st c. A.D.). See also *IThesp* 362 (2nd–3rd c. A.D.): funerary epigram for Potamon, who had made a donation of more than 9,000 drachmas, perhaps for a festival (the *Mouseia*?).

¹²⁸ *IG* IX 2, 90 (1st c. B.C.–1st c. A.D.); cf. W. K. Pritchett, *Greek Archives, Cults, and Topography* (*APXAI A EAAAΣ* 2), Amsterdam 1996, 105–108.

¹²⁹ *CID* IV 27 (ca. 270 B.C.?).

¹³⁰ *IG* V 1, 667; cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 185–186.

¹³¹ *IG* V 1, 18–20 (Charixenus also is mentioned as *athlothetes* of the *Leonideia* — *IG* V 1, 19, l. 16); cf. R. Bogaert, *Banques et banquiers dans les cités grecques*, Leyden 1968, 99–100; Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 192–193. Agesilaus also donated to Sparta a building in the Corinthian order, dedicated "to the deified *Sebastoi* and Lacedaemon" (*IG* V 1, 378); cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 219, n° 29. On Agesilaus and Charixenus see *RP* II, LAC 416 and 361. Another *athlothetes* is attested at Sparta in the 4th c. A.D. in connection with the festival of the *Hyacinthia* (*IG* V 1, 455, l. 13; cf. L. Robert, *Épigramme d'Égine*, in: *Hellenica IV*, Paris 1948, 27–28, n. 6; Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 124).

in A.D. 29, or following her official consecration in A.D. 42, might have contributed money to the annual games (*Livia*) on which this cult was centred¹³². Cn. Cornelius Pulcher, who was *agonothetes* of the *Isthmia kai Kaisareia* during the reign of the Emperor Claudius, took the *Isthmia* back to the Isthmus (they had until then been celebrated at Corinth) and introduced poetry contests for young girls into the programme of the *Kaisareia*, in honour of the *diva Iulia Augusta* (i.e. Livia); in all probability he contributed money to the prizes for these new contests, and maybe also to the restoration of the buildings where the *Kaisareia* took place. Moreover, he offered a banquet to all the citizens of the colony of Corinth¹³³. At Hypata, in Thessaly, T. Flavius Eubiotus, serving as *archiereus* and *agonothetes* of the *theoi Sebastoi*, promised to provide the prizes (crowns) for the victors in the imperial festival (*Sebasta*)¹³⁴.

The *agonothetes* was not the only civic official to play a part in the organization and celebration of festivals and games. Quite obviously, the gymnasiarch too played an important role, given the relationship in Greek cities between *agones*, athletic life and the gymnasium, a relationship that there is no need to stress once again here; suffice it to say that one of the main duties of this official was to ensure that the gymnasium, where athletes as well as normal citizens underwent their physical training, had an adequate provision of oil. But the complex and multifaceted nature of Greek religious festivals accounts for the involvement of other officials, such as the *agoranomos*. The latter, who in Greek cities was the official usually in charge of the market and the provision of supplies, played an important role in connection with festivals, since during such events, as we have seen, many people gathered in a city or sanctuary, and commercial activities took place. The *agoranomos*' role in connection with festivals is further proved by the existence in some cases, next to the *agoranomos* of the city, of a special *agoranomos* attached to the *panegyris*¹³⁵.

Inscriptions show that it was not at all infrequent for gymnasiarchs and *agoranomoi* to spend their own money to accomplish their tasks, exactly as the *agonothetai*

¹³² *SEG* 11, 1954, 830; cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 102. Cf. also *IG* V 1, 559 (3rd c. A.D.): honorary inscription for Sex. Eudamus Onasicrates, *archiereus* of the imperial cult, lifelong and hereditary (*dia genous*) priest and *agonothetes* of the *Dioscuroi* and of the contest of the *Megala Dioscureia*, hereditary *agonothetes* of the *Megala Leonideia*: the reference to the hereditary *agonothesia* seems to indicate that an ancestor of the honorand had endowed those games in the past (cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 125).

¹³³ *Corinth* 8.3, n° 153 (new edition and new date — reign of Claudius — by M. Kajava, *When did the Isthmian games return to the Isthmus? (rereading Corinth 8.3.153)*, *CPh* 97 [2002] 168–178); ll. 7–8: [*qui Isthmia ad Isthmum egit [primus omniu]m*]; ll. 9–10: [*carmina ad Iulia]m diva]m Au]g(ustam) virgi]numque certame]n insti[t]u[ut]*]; cf. Kantiréa, *Dieux Augustes* (cf. n. 84) 185–186; see also Camia, Kantiréa, *Imperial Cult* (cf. n. 16), 386–387.

¹³⁴ *IG* IX 2, 44, ll. 5–6: τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἀγωνοθέτην τῶν Σεβαστῶν θεῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς δύο στεφάνοις; cf. L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*, Paris 1940, 193 (and n. 5). See also *Syll*³ 825C, an honorary inscription from Hypata for L. Cassius Petraeus, *archiereus* ἐπὶ τοῖς δὺσιν στεφάνοις (ll. 2–3).

¹³⁵ As already noted, this special *agoranomos* gradually came to be replaced by an official called *panegyriarches*; see *supra*, n. 26.

did¹³⁶. I will limit myself to citing a few examples. At Thisbe a gymnasiarch was honored because, while fulfilling his role at his own expense, he dedicated to Hermes, Herakles and the *polis* a stoa, a gateway and some doors, all of which were likely connected to the city's gymnasium¹³⁷. At Megara, towards the end of the 1st c. A.D., two individuals, most likely father and son, were honoured by the *boule* and the *demos* for holding the gymnasiarchy at their own expense¹³⁸. In the same period the *polis* of Delphi honored the gymnasiarch Archelaos son of Hyginos for providing oil φιλοτείμως καὶ πολυτελῶς¹³⁹. It is also worth mentioning the case of the Spartan notable C. Iulius Theophrastus, who, while gymnasiarch, provided oil for the gymnasium, the *thermai* and the *Machanidai*¹⁴⁰, after buying it at 30 denarii per *hydria*. He was also *agoranomos* (on the occasion of Hadrian's first visit to Sparta) and *sitones*; while holding the latter office, he provided cheap grain in a period of shortage: he bought it at 40 denarii per *medimnos* and made it available at Sparta at 12 per *medimnos*¹⁴¹. Similar acts connected with the provision of supplies were most likely performed by two Elean *agoranomoi*, in one case certainly during the Olympic games. L. Vettulenus Laetus, *agoranomos* during the 216th Olympiad (A.D. 85), was honoured by the ecumenical athletic association, by the athletes who took part in the Olympic games and by the *hiera xystike synodos* for his munificence and generosity, which means that he must have provided food at his own expense, at least in part, for the athletes¹⁴². Ti. Claudius Niceratus held the position of *agoranomos* φιλοτίμως¹⁴³ in a period of shortage; he probably bought some supplies at his own expense so as to make them available at a low price. As he was honoured not only by the *polis* of Elis but also by the Olympic *boule*, Niceratus may have performed his good deed during the celebration of the Olympic games, when the influx of visitors to the sanctuary of Zeus resulted in an increase in the demand for food¹⁴⁴.

¹³⁶ Cf. Quass 1993, 248–252, 260–264.

¹³⁷ *IG* VII 2235 (1st c. B.C.–1st c. A.D.).

¹³⁸ *IG* VII 97–98 (A.D. 80 ?).

¹³⁹ *FD* III 3, 233 (ca. A.D. 80–95).

¹⁴⁰ A building for athletic or balaneutic use (Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 134, 218, n° 2).

¹⁴¹ *SEG* 11, 1950, 492 (age of Hadrian-Antoninus Pius). Theophrastus, one of the wealthiest notables of Roman Sparta, also held other offices, including the ephorate, the eponymous patronomate and the priesthood of Zeus *Olympios*. Cf. Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 153, 158, 161; *RP* II, LAC 510.

¹⁴² *IvO* 436 (A.D. 85); II. 10–13: ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς εἰς αὐτοὺς λ[α]μπρότητος καὶ φιλαν[θρ]ωπίας. Laetus held the charge of gymnasiarch as well, also in this case λαμπρότατα (*IvO* 437; very end of 1st c. A.D.). Cf. *RP* I, EL 339.

¹⁴³ For the economic implications of this and similar terms see *supra*.

¹⁴⁴ *IvO* 478 (3rd c. A.D.). Cf. Zoumbaki 2001, 98–99. Cf. also *SEG* 51, 2001, 488 (reign of Claudius), with Kantiréa, *Dieux Augustes* (cf. n. 84), 164–165: the Spartan notable C. Iulius Spartiaticus, son of the above mentioned C. Iulius Laco, donated 10,000 denarii to the city of Messene to provide both gymnasia with oil; part of Spartiaticus' gift was used to finance sacrifices for the *Sebastoi* (perhaps in connection with the Messenian *Kaisareia* or some other imperial celebration). *IG* V 1, 1176 (Gythium): honorary inscription for Eutychos, a doctor from Gythium, who, together with his wife and daughter, had donated to his city 10,000 denarii

It also occurred sometimes that emperors themselves intervened to help the *poleis* to sustain the costs of festivals. Hadrian's initiatives in favour of the city of Athens are a good example of this phenomenon. It seems that the philhellene *princeps* assumed *in perpetuum* the *agonothesia* of the *Hadrianeia*, as no *agonothetai* of this festival are attested in inscriptions: in other words, he will have allocated an endowment to finance the celebration of the festival, which was likely founded on the initiative of Hadrian himself. Hadrian was also responsible for the institution of the *Panhellenia*, which Dio says he founded soon after giving permission to the *Hellenes* to build a sanctuary for the cult of his own person (the *Panhellenion*). In the same passage Dio goes on to say that Hadrian granted a sum of money to the Athenians, an annual quota of grain and the revenues from the island of Kephallenia¹⁴⁵: a part of the income deriving from these 'gifts' may have been used to finance the celebration of the *Panhellenia*. Furthermore, when visiting Athens in A.D. 124/5, Hadrian held the *agonothesia* of the *Dionysia*¹⁴⁶.

3.3.2. Roman colonies and *munera gladiatoria*

If we take into consideration a Roman colony like Patrai, we see that there euergetism expressed itself, so to speak, through the typical Roman institutions. Following his election to the position of *duovir* (*pro duoviratu*), P. Pomponius Atianus offered a *munus* (i.e. a gladiatorial spectacle) to the colony at his own expense¹⁴⁷. In Roman colonies and *municipia* the offering (*editio*) of *munera* and *ludi scaenici* was usually performed by magistrates (*duoviri* but also *aediles*) — as well as by *sexviri*, *sexviri Augustales* and *Augustales* — upon entering their office as a form of *summa honoraria*¹⁴⁸. Yet, it could also be accomplished by a magistrate as an additional

εἰς μὲν θεωρίας καὶ τὴν τῶν Σεβαστῶν εὐσέβειαν, in addition to contributing another 5,000 denarii for the provision of oil (εἰς ἐλεώσιον).

¹⁴⁵ Cass. Dio 69, 16, 1–2.

¹⁴⁶ SHA *Hadr.* 13, 1; Cass. Dio 69, 16, 1; cf. P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien*, Le Caire 1934, 5 (and n. 4); A. R. Birley, *Hadrian. The restless emperor*, London, New York 1997, 182. Hadrian also financed some restoration works in the theatre of Argos; cf. M. T. Boatwright, *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*, Princeton 2000, 125, n. 62.

¹⁴⁷ Rizakis 1998, n° 53 (2nd–3rd c. A.D.); cf. *RP* I, ACH 190. Atianus also took charge of the provision of food; see A. D. Rizakis, F. Camia, *Magistrati municipali e svolgimento delle carriere nelle colonie romane della provincia d'Acacia*, in: C. Berrendonner, M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni, L. Lamoine (eds.), *Le quotidien municipal dans l'Occident romain*, Clermont-Ferrand 2008, 231. Cf. also Rizakis 1998, n° 51 (2nd c. A.D.): *munera* offered *ob honorem* by an anonymous magistrate. According to G. Ville, *La gladiature en Occident des origines à la mort de Domitien*, Rome 1981, 125–129, 155–156, starting from the end of the reign of Augustus, gladiatorial combats and *venationes* were associated at Rome (and in the provinces) in a *munus iustum* or *legitimum*.

¹⁴⁸ Municipal laws regulated the obligation of magistrates and of *sexviri*, *sexviri Augustales* and *Augustales* to offer *munera* and *ludi scaenici* during their office; according to the *Lex Ursonensis*, chap. 70–71, *duoviri* and *aediles* had to give at least HS 2,000 for the costs of *munera* and *ludi*, but they could receive a subsidy from the city; see also *ILS* 7210. Cf. Duncan-Jones 1974, 149; Ville, *Gladiature* (cf. n. 147), 175–193; Rizakis 1998, 61.

benefaction for having been elected to an office (*ob honorem*), usually as a consequence of a promise (*pollicitatio*), made either before or after appointment to that office¹⁴⁹.

Gladiatorial combats and wild-beast shows (*venationes*) not only spread in the eastern part of the Empire — and even in completely Greek cities like Athens — but they also came to represent one of the main events in the celebrations attached to the imperial cult. Municipal and provincial imperial priests used to offer such spectacles in honour of the emperors, often out of their own pocket, and L. Robert has suggested that the *editio of munera* was "obligatoire pour les grands-prêtres des provinces, légitime et facultative pour ceux des cités"¹⁵⁰.

Although there is no available epigraphic evidence for Corinth regarding *munera gladiatoria* or *venationes*, that such events took place there is shown by both the archaeological data¹⁵¹ and some literary sources¹⁵². Among the latter, one deserves

¹⁴⁹ Cf. *Apul. met.* 10, 18: *Thiasus ... oriundus patria Corintho ... ut eius prosapia atque dignitas postulabat, gradatim permensis honoribus quinquennali magistratu fuerat destinatus, et ut splendori capessendorum responderet fascium, munus gladiatorium triduanum spectaculi pollicitus latius munificentiam suam porrigebat*; see F. Millar, *The World of the Golden Age*, JRS 71 (1981) 68. For the difference between fixed payments for office (= *summae honorariae*) and spontaneous *ob honorem* payments, see R. Duncan-Jones, *Costs, outlays and summae honorariae from Roman Africa*, PBSR 30 (1962) 66, n. 49; Duncan-Jones 1974, 86–87 (and n. 6); Jacques, Scheid, *Rome* (cf. n. 44) 255–256; cf. also Fr. Jacques, *Ampliatio et mora: évergètes récalcitrants d’Afrique romaine*, *AntAfr* 9 (1975) 159–180 (esp. 159–167), who notes (p. 163) that inscriptions do not always permit the separation of the *summa honoraria* from the *pollicitationes*.

¹⁵⁰ Robert, *Gladiateurs* (cf. n. 134) 272–275; cf. Ville, *Gladiature* (cf. n. 147) 207–208; E. Bouley, *Jeux romains dans les provinces balkano-danubiennes du II^e siècle avant J.-C. à la fin du III^e siècle après J.-C.*, Paris 2001, 204–205; P. M. Nigdelis, *Επιγραφικά Θεσσαλονίκεια. Συμβολή στην πολιτική και κοινωνική ιστορία της αρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης*, Thessaloniki 2006, 73–93 (gladiatorial games and *venationes* at Thessaloniki and Beroia). At Thasos and in Thrace *archiereis* δι’ ὄπλων are attested, this expression evidently referring to one of these municipal imperial priests’ main tasks, that is the organization of gladiatorial spectacles; cf. Bouley, *Jeux romains* (op. cit.), 207–209.

¹⁵¹ With Patrai (for whose ‘stadium-theatre’ see most recently V. Di Napoli, *Entertainment building of the Roman Peloponnese: theatres, odea, and amphitheatres and their topographical distribution*, in: *RP III*, 259 [and n. 41] and A. D. Rizakis, *Colonia Augusta Achaica Patrensis: réaménagements urbains, constructions édilitaires et la nouvelle identité patréenne*, in: *RP III*, 136–137), Corinth is the only known city of the province of Achaia which had an amphitheatre (H. N. Fowler, *Corinth and the Corinthia*, in: *Corinth. Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. I. Introduction, Topography, Architecture*, Cambridge, MA 1932, 89–91). In addition, the Roman colony modified the theatre and the *odeion* in order to make them apt to host this type of spectacle; fragments of frescoes with scenes of *venationes* have been found in the theatre (R. Stillwell, *Corinth. Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. II. The Theatre*, Cambridge, MA 1952, 84–98), while in the *odeion* structures have been unearthed that may be interpreted as cages for animals (O. Broneer, *Corinth. Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. X. The Odeum*, Cambridge, MA 1932, 146–147).

¹⁵² Dion Chrys. *Or.* 31, 121; *Apul. met.* 10, 18 (see *supra*, n. 149).

further consideration for its financial implications. It is a letter included in the correspondence of the emperor Julian, but of disputed date and authorship, concerning a quarrel between Argos and Corinth about sums of money the former owed to the latter for the staging of wild-beast shows (*venationes*) in the Roman colony¹⁵³. Based on this letter, A. J. S. Spawforth has suggested that the *venationes* referred to in it would be part of a major festival held at Corinth — in the frame of the imperial cult administered by the Achaean league — which was financed through contributions of the cities belonging to the *koinon*, maybe with the sanction of the Roman authorities¹⁵⁴. This system of funding, indeed, would closely match that known for other federal and provincial imperial cults, such as the imperial cult of the province of Asia, where the *koinon* appointed special officials charged with the management of the sums owed by each provincial city¹⁵⁵. With regard to this, Spawforth has also proposed that two lists of cities belonging to the province of Achaia¹⁵⁶ should be interpreted as the record of the payments made by the cities of the Achaean *koinon* taking part in the celebrations at Corinth. The fact that in these lists there are *poleis* which did not belong to the Achaean league — the island of Kephallenia, with its three *poleis*, and one or two Eleutherolaconian *poleis* (Boiai and ? Leuktra) — however, makes Spawforth himself admit that “these inscribed lists in the present state of knowledge raise more questions than they answer”¹⁵⁷. As an alternative, the payments of Argos to Corinth could be explained in terms of a Roman financial ‘attribution’, the quota paid by the *polis* of Argos — which would retain its full administrative autonomy — towards the funding of *venationes* (and most likely gladiatorial games too), maybe held in association with the Isthmian games¹⁵⁸. As

¹⁵³ J. Bidez, *L'empereur Julien. Œuvres complètes. I.2. Lettres et fragments*, Paris 1924, n° 198; for date and authorship see Spawforth 1994, 212–215.

¹⁵⁴ Spawforth 1994, arguing for a date between A.D. 80 and 120 (see in particular p. 229 for the possibility that the Roman authorities sanctioned the system of annual contributions by the member cities of the Achaean *koinon*).

¹⁵⁵ Dion Chrys. *Or.* 35, 17; J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, München 1965, 70, 96, 155–157; Price, *Rituals* (cf. n. 6), 54 and 129.

¹⁵⁶ *IG* IV 1605 (= *Corinth* 8.1, n° 13); *IG* IV 619 (Argos) — second quarter of the 2nd c. A.D. (?). With the sole exception of the three *poleis* of the island of Kephallenia, all of the other cities mentioned in these lists belong to the Peloponnese.

¹⁵⁷ Spawforth 1994, 224–226 (quot. at p. 226). The difficulty could be overcome by admitting that from time to time even cities which did not belong to the Achaean league asked, and were permitted, to take part in the imperial cult administered by the league, thus contributing money to the organization of the imperial festival. As Spawforth himself admits, however, “on this point we are moving on to extremely speculative ground” (p. 226).

¹⁵⁸ B. Keil, *Ein Λόγος συστατικός*, *NAWG* (Phil.-hist. Kl.) 1913, 7–9; U. Laffi, *Adtributio e contributio. Problemi del sistema politico-amministrativo dello stato romano*, Pisa 1966, 156–158; A. Heller, “*Les bêtises des Grecs*”. *Conflits et rivalités entre cités d'Asie et de Bithynie à l'époque romaine (129 a.C.–235 p.C.)*, Bordeaux 2006, 70. On ‘attribution’ see J.-M. Bertrand, *Le statut du territoire attribué dans le monde grec des Romains*, in: E. Frézouls (ed.), *Sociétés rurales dans l'Asie Mineure et la Syrie hellénistiques et romaines: actes du colloque organisé à Strasbourg*, Strasbourg 1987, 95–106 and idem, *Territoire donné, territoire attribué: note sur la pratique de l'attribution dans le monde impérial de Rome*, *CCG* 2 (1991) 125–164.

indicated by Spawforth, however, the reference in the letter in question to "many cities"¹⁵⁹ contributing money for the staging of wild-beast shows at Corinth is problematic, since "it would certainly be surprising to find "many" cities in Greece" treated like Argos¹⁶⁰.

In any case, at Corinth, as in Patrai, *duoviri* and other magistrates will have offered *munera* (and *ludi scaenici*) in fulfillment of their legal obligations or as additional benefactions, as indicated by the story referred to in Apuleius' *Golden Ass* about a certain Thiasus, a citizen of Corinth, who offered a three-day gladiatorial show following his appointment to the quinquennial *duovirate*¹⁶¹. More than the absence of inscriptions concerning gladiatorial games, however, what is remarkable in the colony is the persistence of traditional Greek offices such as those of the *agonothetes* (of the *Isthmia kai Kaisareia*) — the highest charge of the municipal *cursus* at Corinth¹⁶² — and the *agoranomos*. As we have seen (Pulcher, Iuvenianus), these officials were not only directly involved in the organization of festivals, but in some cases also contributed money to them. In this respect, even in the strategies of financing its civic activities, the Roman colony of Corinth shows the same combination of both traditionally Greek and typically Roman features which characterizes other aspects of its life, such as the imperial cult or the use of language.

Conclusions

At the end of this review on the strategies used by the *poleis* of Greece in the Late Hellenistic and Imperial periods to cover the costs of festivals and related activities — such as those centred on the gymnasium — we can conclude that the picture which emerges basically confirms what is known for other areas of the Roman East: the financing of festivals and games was secured by a combination of public funding, including the revenues of agonistic foundations administered by civic officials, and private munificence, taking the form of benefactions by both office-holders and private citizens. Judging from the variety and number of the above mentioned

¹⁵⁹ Ps.-Iul. *epist.* 198, 409b.

¹⁶⁰ Spawforth 1994, 217. One could also imagine another scenario, slightly different from that supposed by Spawforth, which would avoid the unlikely case of a formal financial 'attribution' of several cities in Greece to Corinth: for a very specific occasion, that is in order to secure the organization of an event (*venationes* and gladiatorial games) most likely connected with the imperial cult and taking place in the capital seat of the province — but not necessarily organized in the framework and under the aegis of the Achaean *koinon* — the Roman authorities would have permitted the colony of Corinth to ask other *poleis* to contribute money to that celebration. In any case, the interpretation of the letter in question remains doubtful, also due to its possible implications for the *vexata quaestio* of the nature of the imperial Achaean *koinon* and of the existence of a provincial imperial cult in Greece, issues which cannot be dealt with here (see now F. Camia, *Theoi Sebastoi. Il culto degli imperatori romani in Grecia* (provincia Achaia) *nel secondo secolo d.C.*, Atene 2011, 236–242).

¹⁶¹ Apul. *met.* 10, 18 (see *supra*, n. 149).

¹⁶² See Rizakis, Camia, *Magistrati municipali* (cf. n. 147), 226, 229–230.

examples — to which others could be added¹⁶³ — it would seem that in the balance between public and private funding the latter form of financing weighed more than the former. One should always consider, however, the ‘pitfalls’ of the epigraphic evidence: to ‘publicize’ benefactions was in the interest both of the notables (who could thus increase their prestige) and of the civic authorities (who hoped to encourage others to behave in the same way), so acts of euergetism are more likely to appear in inscriptions than other more ordinary forms of funding. What is apparent, in any case, is the fundamental role that civic aristocracies played not only with regard to festivals and games, but also in the political, social and cultural life at large. Yet, the situation was bound to change. If in the first two centuries of the Empire the wealthier citizens were (more or less) willing, at least in the eastern provinces, to bear on their shoulders what A. J. S. Spawforth has rightly called “the price to pay for local political predominance”¹⁶⁴ — even though already in this period there is clear evidence for reluctance in holding onerous charges and liturgies, and of the resort to compulsion by civic (and imperial) authorities — by the late third century, partly as a consequence of the crisis that had hit the Roman world, to find candidates ready to assume the financial burden of public functions had become much more difficult for local communities, and direct compulsion much more widespread¹⁶⁵. Local benefactors, therefore, were much rarer. At Patrai, probably in the fourth century, a certain Basilios Oxyliides assumed alone and voluntarily the usually collegial charge of *duovir quinquennalis*, performing at his own expense for an entire year an impressive series of benefactions (restoration of baths; offering of banquets, gold and clothes; free distributions of grain, oil and wine): in the honorary epigram of epic overtones which was set up by the city of Patrai to perpetuate the memory of Basilios’ outstanding

¹⁶³ For some examples of building activities — in connection with festivals — financed by members of the elite see *IG V 1*, 232 (Sparta; early 2nd c. A.D.): building activities in the sanctuary of the Dioscuri financed by P. Memmius Pratolaus and his wife Volusene Olympiche; *SEG 35*, 1985, 343 (Messene; ca. A.D. 3–14): list of private contributors for the restoration of a gymnasium and other public buildings (see also *IG V 1*, 1444B and 1462); *SEG 28*, 1978, 396 (Argos; 1st–2nd c. A.D.): dedication of three *balaneia* by local benefactors; *Corinth 8.2*, n° 232 (Corinth; Neronian): works for the paving of the theatre financed by an aedile (probably of freedman status). For cases of subscriptions see e.g. *IG II² 2334* (Athens; ca. middle of the 2nd c. B.C.): public subscription for the construction of the second (later) theatre of Piraeus; *IG II² 2360* (Athens, but originally from Anthedon, Boeotia; ca. middle of the 2nd c. B.C.): subscription by the members of an association of *synhytai* of Zeus *Karaios* and Anthas for the realization of a gymnasium consecrated to the two gods; cf. Roesch, *Études* (cf. n. 99) 112–117.

¹⁶⁴ Cartledge, Spawforth 2002, 156.

¹⁶⁵ See Jones, *The Greek City* (cf. n. 45) 181–191; P. Garnsey, *Aspects of the Decline of the Urban Aristocracy in the Empire*, in: ANRW II 1 (1974) 229–252 (esp. 230–241); S. Mitchell, *The Greek city in the Roman world: the case of Pontus and Bithynia*, in: *Πρακτικά του Η’ διεθνούς συνεδρίου ελληνικής και λατινικής επιγραφικής, Αθήνα, 3–9 Οκτωβρίου 1982*, Athens 1984, 125–127; Duncan-Jones, *Structure and Scale* (cf. n. 44), 161–173. Cf. *Apul. met.* 4, 9. Of course, differences from place to place should be taken into consideration.

munificence, the fact that he had assumed the charge of *duovir* alone and voluntarily was outlined as a mark of exceptional distinction¹⁶⁶.

Bibliographical abbreviations

- Bekker-Nielsen, T. 2008: *Urban Life and Local Politics in Roman Bithynia. The Small World of Dion Chrysostomos*, Aarhus.
- Calvet, M., Roesch, P. 1966: *Les Sarapieia de Tanagra*, RA (1966) 297–332.
- Cartledge, P., Spawforth, A. J. S. 2002: *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta. A tale of two cities*, London, New York.
- Chandezon, Ch. 2000: *Foires et panégyries dans le monde grec classique et hellénistique*, REG 113, 70–100.
- De Ligt, L. 1993: *Fairs and Markets in the Roman Empire*, Amsterdam.
- De Ligt L., De Neeve, P. W. 1988: *Ancient Periodic Markets: Festivals and Fairs*, Athenaeum 66, 391–416.
- Deshours, N. 2006: *Les mystères d'Andania: étude d'épigraphie et d'histoire religieuse*, Bordeaux.
- Duncan-Jones, R. 1974: *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies*, Cambridge.
- Fröhlich, P. 2004: *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.)*, Genève, Paris.
- Geagan, D. J. 1967: *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*, Athens.
- Migeotte, L. 1984: *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques. Recueil des documents et analyse critique*, Québec.
- 2006: *Le financement des concours dans la Béotie hellénistique*, in: *Coins, Cults, History and Inscriptions VII. Studies in Honor of John M. Fossey III*, The Ancient World 36, 14–25.
- 2010: *Le financement des concours dans les cités hellénistiques: essai de typologie*, in: B. Le Guen (ed.), *L'argent dans les concours du monde grec. Actes du colloque international, Saint-Denis et Paris, 5–6 décembre 2008*, Paris, 127–143.
- Mitchell, S. 1990: *Festivals, Games, and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor*, JRS 80, 183–193.
- Quass, F. 1993: *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens*, Stuttgart.
- Rizakis, A. D. 1998: *Achaïe II. La cité de Patras: Epigraphie et histoire*, Athènes.
- RP I = A.D. Rizakis, S. Zoumbaki, M. Kantiréa (eds.), *Roman Peloponnese I. Roman personal names in their social context*, Athens 2001.
- RP II = A.D. Rizakis, S. Zoumbaki, Cl. Lepenioti (eds.), *Roman Peloponnese II. Roman personal names in their social context*, Athens 2004.

¹⁶⁶ Rizakis 1998, n° 37; on the individual see also Zoumbaki 2001, 241–242, B 4.

- RP III = A. D. Rizakis, Cl. Lepenioti (eds.), *Roman Peloponnese III. Society, economy and culture under the Roman Empire: continuity and innovation*, Athens 2010.
- Sartre, M. 1991: *L'Orient romain. Provinces et sociétés provinciales en Méditerranée orientale d'Auguste aux Sévères (31 avant J.-Ch. — 235 après J.-Ch.)*, Paris.
- Spawforth, A. J. S. 1994: *Corinth, Argos and the Imperial Cult: Pseudo-Julian, Letters 198*, *Hesperia* 63, 211–232.
- Wörle, M. 1988: *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*, München.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2001: *Elis und Olympia in der Kaiserzeit*, Athen.

Institute for Greek and Roman Antiquity (KERA)
The National Hellenic Research Foundation
Vas. Konstantinou 48
GR — 11635 Athens
fcamia@eie.gr

Francesco Camia