

Crowns at Magnesia

William J. Slater and Daniela Summa

THE DOSSIER in which the citizens of Magnesia on the Meander recorded their efforts concerning their festival of Artemis Leukophryene is the most extensive known to us in which a city explains why and how it is upgrading a festival. It has been recently republished by K. Rigsby in his very valuable collection of *asylia* documents, which now allows an overview not previously possible.¹ The Magnesia inscriptions were entrusted to Otto Kern, who published the volume promptly in 1900.² *Asylia* was one of the main claims of the Magnesians, eager to rival their neighbours Ephesos and Didyma, and it is mentioned in about eighty documents, which formed a dossier carved on the walls of the agora. They are accompanied by a unique inscription (*I.Magnesia* 16) purporting to explain the history of the Magnesians' request for upgrading the festival and its claims, and which is the subject of the following discussion.

This is the document which Kern called the *Stiftungsurkunde*, and as the explanatory document it has been much discussed, as Rigsby's commentary shows; in particular it has become accepted that one should cite this text in the form in which it was re-edited by J. Ebert in 1982 from an old squeeze in the Berlin Academy.³ There will continue to be arguments about the actual date of the individual acceptances, and the mani-

¹ K. Rigsby, *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1996).

² O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin 1900).

³ J. Ebert, "Zur Stiftungsurkunde der Leukophryena in Magnesia am Mäander," *Philologus* 126 (1982) 198–216. The latest scholar to follow Ebert is E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Laws* (Leiden 2005) 107 n.564, citing Rigsby's discussion.

festly forged⁴ Cretan letter *I.Magnesia* 20 belongs with the fabulous foundation narratives; certainly many will be epitomes, which makes it difficult to estimate what was actually decreed or not decreed. As for the much-disputed chronology of the actual upgrading of the festival, we are happy to summarize Rigsby's balanced discussion, which seems to be widely accepted, along with Ebert's text.⁵ This suggests that in probably 221 B.C. the Magnesians made their first attempt to upgrade the status of their festival (so they allege) as the result of an oracle from Apollo and an epiphany of Artemis; but this effort, which was directed to the Greeks of Asia and perhaps only to Ionians, got nowhere, as they themselves admit at line 24, where one will follow Ebert's palmary *παρηλκύσθησαν*, "were fobbed off"⁶ (which Summa now reads clearly from her new squeeze), rather than Kern's supplement *παρη[κο]ύσθησαν*. It clearly is a polite term for "were frustrated." For whatever reason, not enough of the cities of Asia wanted to recognize or accept the new claims of the festival, which indeed, though it lasted a long time, never became prestigious.⁷ Here we have that rarest of epigraphic data, viz. an admission of failure, but of course it is recorded only as a rhetorical foil for the following claim to success, a rather elegant structure. One must suppose that the Thespians when they upgraded their Mouseia far less ambitiously at almost the same time had had perhaps the same

⁴ A. Chaniotis, "Empfängerformular und Urkundenfälschung: Bemerkungen zum Urkundendossier von Magnesia am Mäander," in R. G. Khoury (ed.) *Urkunden und Urkundenformulare im klassischen Altertum und in den orientalischen Kulturen* (Heidelberg 1999) 51–69.

⁵ R. Parker, "New 'Panhellenic' Festivals in Hellenistic Greece," in R. Schlesier and U. Zellmann (eds.), *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Münster 2004) 9–22; C. Vial, "A propos des concours de l'Orient méditerranéen à l'époque hellénistique," in D. Probst (ed.), *L'Orient Méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée* (Toulouse/Rennes 2003) 311–328.

⁶ Rigsby, *Asyria* 185–186, has justified this term in detail; the old squeeze was illegible at this point.

⁷ W. J. Slater, "The Pantomime Tiberius Iulius Apolaustus," *GRBS* 36 (1995) 263–292, at 270 n.15.

problem.⁸ In any case, perhaps thirteen years later in 208 the Magnesians made a more ambitious and costly effort and were successful in having their festival recognized throughout the Greek world, not just in Asia, as the extraordinary surviving dossier demonstrates. The political reason is probably to be found in the words “with the approval of the kings” (line 30).⁹ It was the same mentality that encouraged the Thespians to call on the help of the Ptolemies and Attalids.¹⁰ Festival upgrades were more likely to succeed with royal support and oracles.¹¹

Rigsby’s text follows that of the late Joachim Ebert, who examined the difficult squeeze in Berlin in 1981.¹² This improved text of *IuM* 16 with the approximate numbers of missing letters, which were not indicated in Kern, is as follows.¹³

[·7·]εσ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρεια ·[·20·]
 [·8·]ν δύο δ[ο]θ[ῆ]ναι καὶ τοιαύτης [·18·]
 [·7·]αὐτοῖς τελε[ῖ]ν πάντας τοὺς προειρημένους ·8·]
 [·7·]ς ὁ θεὸς καθ’ οὗς ἱερὰν τηρήσουσι τῆμ π[ό]λιν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ]
 [ὔστε]ρον ἐπιφαινομένης αὐτοῖς Ἀρτέμι[δο]ς Λε[υκοφρυην]ῆς ἔπεμ]- 5
 [λώ]ιον εἶμεν καὶ ἄμεινον τοῖς σε[β]ομένοις Ἀπ[ό]λλωνα Πύθι]-
 [ο]ν καὶ Ἄρτεμιν Λευκοφρυηνὴν καὶ τὰ[μ] π[ό]λιν καὶ τὰν]
 [ψα]ν Ἀγάριστον, χρηστηριάζει τάδε πρὸς τὴν ἐρώ[τη]σιν αὐτῶν]
 [χ]ώραν τὰμ Μαγνήτων τῶν ἐπὶ Μαιάνδρ[ο]υ [ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσυ]-
 [λ]ον νομιζόντοισ· >—< ἐπιφανοῦς δὲ γενομένης [Ἀρτέμιδος] 10

⁸ D. Knoepfler, “La réorganisation du concours des Mousia à l’époque hellénistique: esquisse d’une solution nouvelle,” in A. Hurst and A. Schachter (eds.), *La Montagne des Muses* (Geneva 1996) 141–167.

⁹ See now J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*² (Oxford 2004), for the problems of Ionian political geography in this period, which remain in part unresolved.

¹⁰ W. Ameling, K. Bringmann, B. Schmidt-Dounas, *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer I* (Berlin 1995) 134–140.

¹¹ L. Robert had maintained that there is no political element to be read into this Hellenistic recognition of one city’s festivals by another, and assumed that it was routine bureaucracy, but this is hard to believe: *Opera minora selecta (OMS)* II 781 = *REA* 38 (1936) 5–28, at 18.

¹² Ebert, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 198–216, on the basis of the old squeeze. He could not see the stone itself because of construction work.

¹³ *I. Magnesia* 16 [Syll.³ 557]; Ebert, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 198–216 [SEG XXXII 1147]; Rigsby, *Asyria* no. 66.

προσδεξάμενοι >< τὸν χ[ρ]ησμὸν ἐπὶ στ[εφανηφόρου]
 Ζηνοδότου, ἐν Ἀθήναις δὲ ἄρ[χο]ντος Θρασυφ[ῶντος Πύθι]-
 α δὲ κιθαρῳδοῦ νικῶντος τ[ῶ]ι προτέρῳ ἔτει ··8··]
 ου Βοιωτίου, Ὀλύμπια δὲ τῶι ὑστέρωι ἔτει τῆν [ἐκατοστὴν]
 καὶ τετρακοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα νικῶντος [τὸ τρίτον] 15
 [π]αγκράτιον Ἀγησιδάμου Μεσσηνίου, >< πρώτ[ον ἀργυρί]-
 την ἀγῶνα θεῖναι τῶν κατοικούντων τὴν Ἀσίαν [ἐψηφίσαν]-
 το, τὴν ἐκδοχὴν τοῦ χρησμοῦ ταύτην λαβόντες, [ὅτι οὗτοι]
 τιμήσουσιν οὕτως Ἄρτεμιν Λευκοφρυηνή[ν], ἄλλ[ως πρὸς]
 τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβῶς ἔχοντες, ἐὰμ Μάγνησιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀ[ρχαίον ἐπό]- 20
 μνοι βωμὸν Ἀρχηγέτιδι γέρα κεχαρισμέν[α ἀποδιδῶσιν,]
 ἅτε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀ[γῶ]νων τὴν ἀρχὴν μὲν ἐπ' ἀργ[υρίωι τε]-
 θέντων, χρόνοι δὲ ὑστερον διὰ χρησμοῦς στεφαν[ιτῶν γεγο]-
 νότων. >< ὡς δὲ ἐπιβ[α]λόμενοι παρηλκύσθησ[αν, ἐπὶ]
 [σ]τεφανηφόρου Μοιραγόρου, ὅς ἐστιν τετραρακ[αιδέκατος] 25
 ἀπὸ Ζηνοδότου, καθ' ὃν αὐτοῖς ἐγένε[τ]ο ὁ χ[ρ]η[σ]μ[ός, φιλιῶν μι]-
 μνησκόμενοι πατριῶν καὶ ἄλλοις ἐπέδειξα[ν πάνθ' ἃ ἐκέχρησ]-
 το· >< στεφανηφοροῦντος δὲ Μοιραγόρου τὸν στεφαν[ίτην ἀγῶνα]
 [ἰ]σοπύθιον, στέφανον διδόντες ἀπὸ πεντήκο[ντ]α χρ[υ]σῶν, ἔθεσαν,] 30
 ἀποδεξαμένων τῶν βασιλέων [κ]αὶ τῶν ἄλλ[ων ἀπάν]-
 τωμ, πρὸς οὓς ἐπρέσβευσαν, κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πό[λεις ψηφισα]-
 [μ]ένων, τιμᾶν Ἄρτεμιν [Λε]υκοφρυηνήν· κα[ὶ] ἰ[σ]χυλον εἶναι
 [τ]ῆμ Μαγνήτωμ πόλιν καὶ χώραν διὰ τὴμ παρα[ίνεσιν τοῦ]
 [θε]οῦ καὶ τὰς ὑπαρχούσας πρὸς πάντας αὐτ[ῶν φιλίας]
 [κα]ὶ οἰκειότητας ἐκ προγόνωμ Μάγνησ[ιν ---] 35

As will become clear, our disagreement with Ebert's reconstruction is with the actual nature of the upgrading itself, and so with his supplement at the end of line 16. Rigsby (p.188) explains his own preference for Ebert's supplement instead of Kern's: "Ebert's [ἀργυρί]την eliminates the self-contradiction that Kern's [στεφανί]την had involved. The oracle did not specify what the proper honor for Artemis was, and the Magnesians had to interpret. They intended a gradual promotion of the contest, from local to Asian to Panhellenic, and from moneyed to 'crowned'. For the term (which Ebert, 202 n.17, preferred because of the echo in 22) note the contrast at Ath. 584C (οὐ γὰρ στεφανίτης ὁ ἀγὼν ἐστὶν ἀλλ' ἀργυρίτης); but [χρηματί]την or [θεματί]την are also possible." But it is not evident that the Magnesians intended such a "gradual pro-

motion.”

Ebert observed that earlier Robert¹⁴ had hinted in the same direction, when in a footnote he stated that he would deal with this inscription, which had been misunderstood, adding that the supplements with which it had been decorated (he means: by Kern) make it say in a crucial passage the exact opposite of what in his opinion was expressed there. Robert returned to the issue in 1983 when he summarized Ebert’s article favourably in one of the last Bulletins that he and J. Robert edited, and again in the posthumous *Claros I*.¹⁵ Clearly he agreed with Ebert’s central interpretation that the two attempts by the Magnesians concerned first argyritic then stephanitic competition, and indeed he himself had often touched on the “capital distinction” of crowned versus thematic contests.¹⁶

Kern had restored *stephaniten* in line 16, and had understood that on both occasions the Magnesians had attempted to get themselves a stephanitic competition—the first failed, the second successful. Ebert, obviously motivated by the clear distinction made in line 22 between inferior argyritic and superior stephanitic, postulated that the first competition was argyritic and failed, the second was stephanitic and succeeded, and he was able to find supplements that could be made to agree with this view.¹⁷ The emphatic distinction of stephanitic versus argyritic has dictated the interpretation, unjustly in our view, and we begin with a clarification.

Two points must be emphasized about the term “stephanitic.” First, probably the phrase “stephanitic agon” becomes

¹⁴ Ebert, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 203; Robert, *OMS* II 776 (= *REA* 13).

¹⁵ *Bull. épigr.* 1983, 342; L. and J. Robert, *Claros I Décrets hellénistiques* (Paris 1989) 53 in the long footnote 270.

¹⁶ E.g. *OMS* II 784–785, VII 779, VI 709–710, and often. See next note.

¹⁷ For Robert’s views on this issue see Parker’s criticisms, which overlap partly with those of Vial (see above, n.5). We do not signal our many agreements with both authors. H. W. Pleket, “Einige Betrachtungen zum Thema ‘Geld und Sport,’” *Nikephoros* 17 (2004) 77–89, at 80, speaks of “thematische Spiele—die in der von Louis Robert und anderen verteidigten Orthodoxie den heiligen Kranzspielen engengesetzt werden: Geld versus Symbolpreis.” But Robert was more nuanced.

semi-technical around 300 B.C.;¹⁸ but it is important to the following argument to understand precisely whence the term derived its prestige in Hellenistic times. All stephanitic victories were not equal. The person honoured in Lindos ca. 225 B.C. for having won all the stephanitic contests of the Lindians was not likely to be considered by other cities to be in the same league as an Olympic victor (*I.Lindos* 123). But stephanitic victors are singled out in Pergamon, Magnesia, and Kos as a special honored civic group already in the second century B.C., where they include the local victors, and their status may already have been validated by specific privileges as in imperial times.¹⁹ By 200 B.C. therefore we can assume that stephanitic victors were formally classified, and presumably registered, in their society as a group, and this category in turn excluded those victors who were not stephanitic and so less prestigious.

Second, the specific honours awarded to a crowned victor depended not on some central authority but on multiple agreements struck between independent, highly competitive, and often warring cities.²⁰ In order for the term “stephanitic” to be fully explained, it requires elaboration by a further term such as isopythic as here (line 29), just as at the Mouseia of

¹⁸ *IG IV.1²* 68.73 = *Staatsvertr.* III 446 (League of the Greeks, 302 B.C.).

¹⁹ The problems of festival status in imperial times must be ignored here, though they are important, as has been demonstrated in a number of recent articles by J.-Y. Strasser, e.g. “Chorales et pythales d’époque impériale,” *BCH* 126 (2002) 97–142. The most important document for showing that imperial festivals were formally upgraded to “sacred” (or “iselastic”) is the memorial to Demonstratos Damas *I.Sardis* 79, now treated in detail by Strasser, “La carrière du pancratiaste Markos Aurelios Demonstratos Damas,” *BCH* 127 (2003) 251–299, with many insightful suggestions. See Pleket, *Nikephoros* 17 (2004) 77–89, for some criticisms. For Hellenistic *hieronikai* as a group in processions see *LSAM* 32.39–40 (Magnesia) from 185/4 B.C., *IscrCos* ED 85.9, and more generally M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 560, with further reference to G. Nachtergaeel, *Les Galates en Grèce* (Brussels 1977) 341 ff., and L. and J. Robert, *Claros* 20–23.

²⁰ A good overview of the politics involved in festival creation is given by A. Chaniotis, “Sich selbst feiern? Städtische Feste des Hellenismus im Spannungsfeld von Religion und Politik,” in M. Wörrle and P. Zanker (eds.), *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Munich 1994) 147–172. He does not deal with our problem.

Thespieae,²¹ and Robert in fact said as much in discussing the Soteria of Delphi upgraded earlier in the same century.²² Any city can claim to have a sacred or crowned festival; other cities are only affected if they appoint *theoroi* to that festival or formally decree its acceptance in some form. Likewise, isopythic status can be claimed by the city holding a festival but *can only be awarded in whole or part by the home-city of the victor of that festival*. Inherent in this procedure is the distinction between just local money and hopefully international (or at least more than local) honours. On the other hand the term “panhellenic” should not be used, and not only because it is not an ancient term, as Robert pointed out long ago.²³ It is still employed as a convenience by scholars, who have even called it a technical term; others may or may not make this anachronism clear.²⁴ Nonetheless it can easily mislead. The honours awarded for an isopythic victory in these Hellenistic foundations were the equivalent of those awarded by that particular city to its Pythian victors; they would not necessarily be the same as those of any other city. Indeed the Magnesians had their festival declared parochially iso-nemic by Argos and iso-isthmic by Corinth. A festival that claims to be stephanitic and isopythic says nothing about the number of cities, if any, that have “accepted” its claims, unless like Magnesia it literally sets that information in stone; but even there, where we have this huge

²¹ *IG VII 1735b*; corrected after M. Feyel, *Contribution à l'épigraphie béotienne* (Le Puy 1942) 91–93; cf. S. Aneziri, *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten* (Stuttgart 2003) 274.

²² *OMS II 785*.

²³ *OMS II 784*; Vial, in Probst, *L'Orient* 311–328, avoids the term “panhellenic” but follows Ebert's text of *I.Magnesia* 16.

²⁴ B. LeGuen, *Les Associations de Technites Dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique* (Nancy 2000) I 144 n.421, “devenu panhellénique au sens technique du terme”; Knoepler, in Hurst and Schachter, *La Montagne* 165: “la catégorie ‘panhellénique’ (au sens technique du terme).” Rigsby, *Asyria* p.64, repeats Robert's monition with further clarification. Hellenistic use of the noun “Panhellenes” is usually in the context of the great festivals, as pointed out by J.-L. Ferrary, “Rome et la géographie de l'Hellénisme: réflexions sur ‘hellènes’ et ‘panhellènes’ dans les inscriptions de l'époque romaine,” in O. Salomies (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman Context* (Helsinki 2001) 19–35, at 35 n.85.

dossier, the decrees of the cities surprisingly almost never acknowledge explicitly their award of isopythic status. Whether this omission is deliberate, as being subsumed in the fact of the acceptance, is now impossible to determine, but since the Magnesians set such store by it, the omission is worth recording. Isopythic status therefore is not something legally enforceable except in the home city of a fortunate victor; in the festival city, as in Magnesia, it is a general claim and no more. The use of the term “panhellenic” tends to disguise this complex problem, by equating these new Hellenistic festival foundations with the great games like the Olympia and Pythia, though we cannot know how many cities regularly sent *theoroi* even to these great games.

To return to the inscription: it is set out in a chronological framework and the remarkable punctuation of spaces and dashes (allowing for error in line 11) was evidently meant to support the literary structure.²⁵ The sections begins, “When X happened ...” followed by details of the exact year, and then the result. Fundamental in our reading is the assertion in line 23 that it is normal to upgrade festivals from argyritic to stephanitic *via oracles*. This is repeated in 33, whether we restore *paraklesin* or not. This is the axiom on which the Magnesians are operating. In fact the Artists of Dionysus in the Louvre decree for Kraton²⁶ ca. 170 claim in a general way that the festivals under their jurisdiction (Pythia, Mouseia, Soteria, Agrionia) did have the approval of oracles, by which they meant Apollo, and also of kings, which was probably true. To which the Magnesians also added an epiphany of their goddess which had led to the oracle. If one looks more closely, what they claim is that they were given the oracles about their *asylia*, but only fourteen years later, in 208, “demonstrated (*epedeixan*)

²⁵ The punctuation in the form >-< is not found in any of the other documents which are according to Kern mostly by the same hand (*I. Magnesia* p.12, “Die Inschriften sind zum grössten Teile zu derselben Zeit und die meisten auch von derselben Hand eingemeisselt worden: ersteres gilt sicher von Nr.16–84”).

²⁶ Le Guen, *Associations* no. 45 = Aneziri, *Vereine* D10 = *IG XI.4* 11061 + 1136.18–20.

them” to others. Now, since the Magnesians apparently got their oracle earlier, in 221, as a result of which they undertook some festival project, but only undertook to show the oracle to others later, in 208, it follows that it was in 221 not 208 that they wished to upgrade their festival, and that their first mistake was in not publicizing the oracular basis for it, i.e. in not getting their *theoriai* in place, not having an advertising strategy with the Greeks of Asia. Secondly they imply that they had not set their sights high enough; that is, they should have publicized their festival more widely than just the Greeks of Asia. Ebert indeed supposed that it was the intention of the Magnesians from the beginning in 221 to establish stephanitic games, but they were somehow slow in implementing the project until 208; Kern assumed initial failure,²⁷ which seems to us correct. If they wanted an upgrade in 221, then the local argyritic festival for their principal goddess would not surprisingly have already been in existence before 221, as many have surmised. This hypothesis seems confirmed by a second consideration.

The contrast between these two dates according to Ebert’s reasoning was between [moneyed] which did not succeed—allegedly because they misunderstood the oracle—and stephanitic which did. But, in truth, there is no surviving statement that they misunderstood the meaning of the oracle, only that they had understood the oracle to command them to establish a [-] festival. Nothing suggests they they would undertake an argyritic foundation in 221 as a result of an oracle, which would be possibly unparalleled. How could they have “made an attempt at a [moneyed] competition and been fobbed off” if they wanted a thematic contest in 221? As we have emphasised, such a contest does not need any international backing at all, and so could not have been frustrated by the non-participation of other cities. A city can only be “fobbed off” if it seeks to establish a stephanitic competition, and needs acceptances from other cities. The Magnesians, it seems, had the right idea, but did not go about it effectively, and failed; their failure, as they claim, was in not advertising their oracle, and not making successful overtures to the Greeks of Asia. They had an oracle

²⁷ Ebert, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 205; Rigsby, *Asyria* pp.188–189.

that their city should be inviolable, which they understood—so they claim and doubtless pronounced publicly—to mean that all the Greeks of Asia should come to honour their patron goddess with gifts, as part of an upgrading of their festival competitions from argyritic to stephanitic. Their optimistic logic may strike us as less than impeccable, but in fact according to the acceptance by Cos, Miletus²⁸ at this same time argues in language which is similar that since the inviolability of its Apollo temple is recognized by kings and all and its oracle as beneficial to kings and all, therefore(!) it is appropriate that its already existing agon of the Didymeia be upgraded to stephanitic and τιμαὶ ὡς μέγιστα be given to its victors by the cities who accept the invitation. No mention of acceptance of isopythic status here, only of a demand for the greatest possible honours, which may amount to the same thing. But there is much consideration of the oracle, and the kings. The isopythic Koreia of Kyzikos are also established along with *asylia* as a result of a Delphic oracle some years later.²⁹

What was it that the Magnesians did differently in 208? Clearly, organize a very extensive set of *theoriai* and get kings to help them, and also instruct other Greeks in the words of the oracle that they already had, i.e. go out and sell their festival on the basis of the authority of Delphic Apollo. They had understood, they say, that the oracle by itself would lead to the other Greeks sending gifts to their goddess (i.e. *sunthusia* and *sumpompe*) and accepting a stephanitic festival. They were reactive, now they are pro-active. But this was not in itself enough, and we shall argue that what they also now clarified was isopythic status. It follows then that Ebert's antithesis stephanitic/thematic is not the basis for the actions of the Magnesians, even though it is mentioned in the inscription. Both times in 221 and

²⁸ *Syll.*³ 590; Rigsby, *Asylia* pp.175 and 184 on the possibility of rivalry between the two cities.

²⁹ L. Robert, *Documents d'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1987) 156–173; C. Habicht, *Epigr.Anat* 38 (2005) 93–100, though K. Rigsby tells us that Habicht now will argue for a somewhat earlier date. Rigsby also provides a nice parallel from Plut. *Agis* 9, where the oracle initially fails and is reworked to provide a more successful outcome.

208 the proposal was for upgraded stephanitic games, but the distinction made throughout the inscription is between the unsuccessful and the successful attempt. We must remove Ebert's supplement *[argyri]ten* in 16 and substitute Kern's *[stephani]ten*. (We do not tackle the problem of penteteric games versus annual, because the inscription does not mention this.)

But there are other problems that Ebert's readings cause, which should also have prevented his supplements gaining acceptance. Especially one's attention is drawn to the remarkable lines 28–29, which Rigsby translates “they established the crowned contest, equal to the Pythia, giving a crown worth fifty gold staters.” The Roberts³⁰ did note the anomaly—to put it mildly—of a gold crown for stephanitic games, but said no more. Vial in his useful article on Hellenistic games nonetheless accepts that the crown of the Leukophryeneia was a gold one of 50 staters, and even asks whether perhaps other competitions did the same thing or this was a peculiarity, and goes so far as to speculate that the crown imitated laurel; and Pleket has now made Ebert's reading part of an attempt to prove that victors did get valuable awards.³¹ Ebert, who proposed the text and recognized the anomaly, was obligated to justify it at some length:³² for after all he was criticizing Kern for not making the proper distinction between the two types of festival.³³ He rightly affirms that victors got specific honours³⁴ from their home cities, but he provides no parallel for the gold crown alleged here, worth between 1200–1500 Attic drachmai awarded by the festival city. Though many scholars affirm that Hellen-

³⁰ J. and L. Robert, *Bull.épigr.* 1983, 342.

³¹ Vial, in Probst, *L'Orient* 319. Pleket's article, *Nikephoros* 17 (2004) 77–89, does not discriminate between the classical, Roman, and Hellenistic evidence; he accepts Ebert's interpretation without recognizing the anomaly (82). There is no evidence for “stephanitic thematic games” in Hellenistic times.

³² Ebert, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 212.

³³ He footnotes Pleket's article, *Stadion* 1 (1976) 57 ff., for the attachment of *Wertpreisen* to crowns. But Pleket provides no parallel for what Ebert is alleging from Hellenistic times.

³⁴ He says *Belohnungen*, which would be payments, but nothing like this is mentioned at Magnesia.

istic victors got cash prizes from their home towns, this is a different issue from the award of honours.³⁵ *Timai* or other similar words after all could mean a statue or *sitesis* in the prytaneion, or another crown, or *eiselasis*, or other awards that are not cash. It is extremely difficult to provide evidence for a cash prize in the home city. We shall come back to this.

Ebert finally argues that he does not think that his alleged crown of 50 staters is meant to substitute for the home honours awarded to victors. The unacceptable implications are (1) that every victor in a minor Hellenistic stephanitic competition will get a gold crown worth 50 staters; (2) that every victor gets exactly the same prize, especially in a competition with hippic and gymnastic events like the Leukophryeneia; (3) that the home cities, many of them very small, would be able to exceed such a prize, as Ebert envisions.

It is permissible at a thematic contest like the Sarapieia of Tanagra to try to award gold crowns of specific value,³⁶ but not here, when the city is emphasising that it is upgrading to vegetal awards from money. Ebert is involving himself in the self-contradiction that he claims to be removing. Now that we are unhappy with the overall interpretation, we need to consider the Greek of Ebert's text at the disputed lines; it is in itself unsatisfactory:

(1) In 29 the verb [ἔθεισαν] comes grammatically too late; with Ebert's supplements one would need it after ἰσοπύθειον.

(2) ἰσοπύθειον comes after the supplement [ἄγωνά] and is proleptic. But it must be proleptic with any supplement. "They <made/called> it isopythic." That is not brought out by Ebert's comment or Rigsby's translation, but it is important. They now did something they had not done before, and officially claimed isopythic status, something confirmed by several of the acceptances.

(3) We still need to know to whom the one 50-stater crown is to

³⁵ So e.g. Parker, in Schlesier and Zellmann, *Mobility* 12: "also often cash rewards." In imperial times, *sitesis*—like the similar *sportula*, or *cena*, or *spyris*—was convertible into cash by registered victors.

³⁶ M. Calvet and P. Roesch, "Les Sarapieia de Tanagra" *RA* (1966) 297–332.

be given, and if not to victor(s), to whom. We need a dative.

Let us rethink the situation. Thirteen years after their failure, after an unremitting and extraordinary expensive sales effort all the way to Sicily and Iraq they got acceptances of a crowned isopythic competition. In other words it was in large part the “isopythic” honour—at this time a relatively new term—that was the issue that was now clarified. Around this time the Hyakinthotropheia of Knidos and later the Koreia of Kyzikos were also made isopythic. We recall that “isopythic” status is meaningless unless it is accepted by other cities. This is what was now undertaken with the help of kings and—perhaps just as important—the Artists of Dionysus, because just as at Thespieae the Artists accept the festival in a wordy decree (*I.Magnesia* 54), behaving, as often, as if they were a city. The problem now concentrates on lines 28 and 29.

A 50-stater crown was not awarded to victors, because there is only one of it. Therefore in line 28 we must remove [ἀγῶνα] and substitute a verb—e.g. Ebert’s [ἔθεσαν] from the next line, or better still [ἀνείπων] which will fit, as we have ascertained. If we keep Ebert’s στεφαν[ίτην] we have: “They made/declared the stephanitic (sc. contest) isopythic,” they being the Magnesians. But whatever one restores one can see that ἰσοπύθιον is proleptic, and is the word that must bear the special emphasis. In the Magnesian inscriptions there is, not surprisingly, no exact parallel, though the reply of the Technitai (*I.Magnesia* 54.24–25) offers something very similar: κ[αὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ὄν] τιθ[έασι Μά]γνητες στεφανίτην ἰσοπύθιον; and better *FD* III.3 261.12, the acceptance καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας οὓς διέγ[νωκε] συντελεῖν στεφανίτα[ς τὸν] τε μουσικὸν ἰσοπύθιον καὶ τὸν γυμνικὸν κα[ὶ ἰππικὸν] ἰσολύμπιον ἀποδέξων[ται].

We can deal with one possible objection: the omission of the word ἀγῶνα. This omission is very rare according to Wilhelm,³⁷ but it is not rare at all but common: we have examples where ἀγών is omitted with ἰππικός,³⁸ γυμνικός,³⁹ θυμελικός,⁴⁰

³⁷ A. Wilhelm, *Hermes* 41 [1906] 69–74, at 71 (*Kleine Schr.* II.4 387–392).

³⁸ *Nouveau Choix* 22.22 (Lebadea); *I.Olympia* 56.45.

³⁹ *IG* IV.1² 98; *FD* III.3 128.6.

⁴⁰ *I.Ilion* 10.28; *SEG* XXIX 452; LeGuen, *Associations* no. 23.8 (Thespieae).

and even μουσικός precisely in *I.Magnesia* 102.13–14 ἀγωνοθέτης τοῦ μουσικοῦ, as Wilhelm had noted; and Hiller compared precisely *I.Magnesia* 16.20 for the same omission in the fragmentary *IG II²* 994, an acceptance of perhaps the Ptoia.⁴¹ (Summa suggests that it is almost normal to omit the word *agona* if it has appeared before, and that this strongly suggests that the full phrase had indeed occurred already, as we proposed, in line 16.) To whom did the Magnesians then give this one mysterious 50-stater crown? The obvious possibility is to their own patron goddess, since valuable crowns are often awarded to gods.⁴² That then fits nicely with the notion of expecting the other cities to give appropriate gifts to the goddess in line 21 and in 32 as they process to the temple. The Magnesians show the way by example; she would be Archegetis or Leukophryene Artemis, here simply [τῆι θεᾶι] which fits the space.

The second attempt was to upgrade specifically to isopythic and at the same time to win wider acceptance for this from all the Greeks. This is in fact almost the same thing; when a city “accepts” the status of another city’s festival and so authorizes its claims to international or at least not merely local status, it approves specific honours for the victors. These may be those claimed by the city that gives the festival, but we have no way of knowing, and there might be several possibilities. Rigsby (p.182) has drawn attention to the varied language in which the many cities accept the Leukophryeneia, and very few mention isopythic honours. Others like the Dionysiac Artists non-committally refer to their acceptance of “the festival which the Magnesians have established as isopythic.” Not being a city but

⁴¹ We have since noted L. Robert, *Etudes d’épigraphie et philologie* (Paris 1938) 56 n.1, citing M. Holleaux, *Etudes d’épigraphie et d’histoire grecques* I (Paris 1938) 133 note.

⁴² *I.Ilion* 10 with commentary; but the most detailed description is in *I.Oropos* 296 = *IG VII* 4252 = Ziehen, *LS* 31, the award of a crown by the Athenian demos to Amphiaraios. Of course a city can award a crown to a city or a group of cities, as Cos did to the cities of Thessaly (M. Segre, “Grano di Tessaglia a Coos,” *RivFil* 62 [1934] 169–193, at 172), but that could not make sense here.

an association,⁴³ their language may be careful; after all relatively many of their members would qualify for isopythic awards.

But at least our suggestion has eliminated the anomaly of a 50-stater crown, which would be the only direct evidence for a stephanitic contest with a cash prize in Hellenistic times. One can now touch on the details of the inscription. D. Summa in April 2006 photographed the stone, which now reposes dusty and badly lit in a cellar of the Pergamon Museum; though it was cleaned for Kern's use after it came to Berlin, it has apparently suffered in the last century; more importantly she was allowed to make a new squeeze, which is the basis for her observations. The main value of this exercise was to estimate the length of the supplements, since a cursory look at Ebert's drawing suggested that some supplements are more crowded than others, despite Kern's assurance that the writing is regular. (Typographical considerations of course can make this rather difficult to present graphically.) Kern himself did not suggest estimates of letters missing, and seems to have been somewhat careless in this respect. But to our surprise it proved possible here and there to confirm some supplements as well. We offer our comments on the possibilities, but only in those supplements that are central to our argument.⁴⁴

16: $\pi\rho\omega\tau[\text{ov } \sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\nu]$ Kern; we restore this instead of Ebert's $\pi\rho\omega\tau[\text{ov } \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\nu]$. In Oxford $\pi\rho\omega\tau[\text{oi}]$ was suggested, but not accepted. $\Pi\rho\omega\tau[$ can be read

17: $[\acute{\epsilon}\psi\eta\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu]$ το Ebert; $[\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\nu]$ το Kern, taking the word from line 24; $[\acute{\epsilon}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\nu]$ το and $[\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\lambda\alpha\nu]$ το we thought of, at first considering them a bit long, but as Summa points out, the T of $\pi\rho\omega\tau[\text{ov}]$ is immediately above the N of $\text{'A}\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$, and so they are perfectly possible with 9–10 letters missing as in 16 and 18; there are other possibilities, but the uncertainty serves to remind us that we do not know exactly what the Magnesians formally attempted with their

⁴³ But they behaved like a city; see now their coinage, C. Lorber and O. Hoover, "An Unpublished Tetradrachm Issued by the Artists of Dionysus," *NC* 163 (2003) 59–68.

⁴⁴ A more detailed listing of previous emendations will be found in Rigsby's authoritative publication, but there appear to be problems in the apparatus on p.186.

oracle in 221, save that they themselves prefer to describe it with hindsight as an entrepreneurial undertaking.

18: Ebert's [ὅτι οὗτοι] possibly right; [καθότι] Kern; but also [ὅτι or ὡς σφόδρα or πάντες].

19: Ebert read] ἄλ[ως πρὸς] but we felt we needed something like [μ]ἄλ[λον δὲ εἰς] for the syntax; and in fact Ebert saw what he took to be a vacat after the last letter of Λευκοφρυηνή[v] and before ΑΛ. Summa has however managed to read ΜΑΛ[clearly and so we confidently insert our suggestion.

20: ἐπὶ τὸν α[can be read. Ebert's "old altar" is ingenious and may well be right, but other possibilities are easily found. The main fact is that the Magnesians wanted other cities to join them in the procession and sacrifice. That would be the *sumpompe* and *sunthusia* that is common at stephanitic festivals with a claim to *theoroi*. The Magnesians initially seem simply and naïvely to have expected that all the rest of the Asian Greeks would join the Magnesians in their procession, and bring gifts and sacrifices. One may compare the importance of the cities sacrificing together in the decrees of *sunthusia* at the Boeotian federal festivals.⁴⁵

21: ἀποδιδῶσιν as a subjunctive is fine; but one should not consider it the only possibility.

24: Ebert's excellent proposal, well defended by Rigsby, can in fact be read clearly as ΠΑΡΗΛΚΥΣΘΗΣ[AN

26: Only X[PHΣΜΟΣ is now visible, not the X[PH]ΣΜ[ΟΣ of Ebert.

29: Summa can read only ΠΕΝΤ[.]Κ[.]Τ[.]XP of Ebert's ΠΕΝΤΗ-ΚΟ[NT]Α and Kern's ΠΕΝΤΗΚ[ONTA], but other supplements do not seem possible.

30: τῶν ἄλλ[ων Ἑλλήνων ἀπάν]τωμ, Kern's supplement, is much too long; but merely removing Ἑλλήνων is too easy, since "kings and all the rest" does not sound right. We wondered whether it was not possible to read τῶν ἄλλ[ων Ἑλλή]νωμ, and Summa thinks it is.

33: All that can be read is ΠΑΡΑ[ΙΝΕΣΙΝ

We attach for simplicity our version of the lines in dispute:

>-< πρῶτ[ον στεφανί]-

την ἀγῶνα θεῖναι τῶν κατοικούντων τὴν Ἀσίαν [ἐψηφίσαν]-
 το, τὴν ἐκδοχὴν τοῦ χρησμοῦ ταύτην λαβόντες, [ὅτι πάντες]
 τιμήσουσιν οὕτως Ἄρτεμιν Λευκοφρυηνήν, μἄλ[λον δὲ εἰς]
 τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβῶς ἔχοντες, ἐὰμ Μάγνησιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀ[ρχαῖον ἐπό]- 20

⁴⁵ See Chaniotis, in Wörrle and Zanker, *Stadtbild* 147–172, for a good study of the importance of these communal processions for Hellenistic cities.

μνοι βωμόν Ἀρχηγέτιδι γέρα κεχαρισμέν[α ἀποδιδώσιν,]
 ἄτε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀ[γ]ώνων τὴν ἀρχὴν μὲν ἐπ' ἀργ[υρίωι τε]-
 θέντων, χρόνοι δὲ ὕστερον διὰ χρησμοῦς στεφαν[ιτῶν γεγο]-
 νότων. >< ὡς δὲ ἐπιβ[α]λόμενοι παρηλκύσθησ[αν, ἐπὶ]
 [σ]τεφανηφόρου Μοιραγόρου, ὅς ἐστιν τετρακ[αιδέκατος] 25
 ἀπὸ Ζηνοδότου, καθ' ὃν αὐτοῖς ἐγένε[τ]ο ὁ χ[ρη]σμ[ός, φιλιῶν μι]-
 μνησκόμενοι πατρίων καὶ ἄλλοις ἐπέδειξα[ν πάνθ' ἃ ἐκέχρησ]-
 το· >< στεφανηφοροῦντος δὲ Μοιραγόρου τὸν στεφαν[ιτην ἀνεῖπον]
 [ἰ]σοπύθιον, στέφανον διδόντες ἀπὸ πεντ[ή]κο[ν]τ[α] χρ[υ]σῶν τῆι θεᾷ,
 ἀποδεξαμένων τῶν βασιλέων [κ]αὶ τῶν ἄλλ[ων Ἑλλή]- 30
 νομ, πρὸς οὓς ἐπρέσβευσαν, κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πό[λεις ψηφισα]-
 [μ]ένων, τιμᾶν Ἄρτεμιν [Λε]υκοφρυην· κα[ὶ] ἄσυλον εἶναι
 [τ]ῆι Μαγνήτῳ πόλιν καὶ χώραν (κτλ.)

they first [voted?] to hold a [stephanitic] contest of those who live in Asia, making this the interpretation of the oracle, that [all? (sc. the Asians)] would honour Artemis in this way; [and even more] showing piety towards the divine, if by accompanying the Magnesians to the [old?] altar they (the Asians) would render gifts pleasing to the Foundress, inasmuch as other contests had been established originally with moneyed prizes, but later as a result of oracles became crowned. But when they were frustrated in the undertaking, when Moiragoras was stephanephoros, the fourteenth from Zenodotos under whom the oracle was given them, remembering their ancestral [friendships], they revealed to others all [that had been prophesied]; and in Moiragoras' year they [proclaimed?] the crowned <competition> as isopythic, giving a crown worth 50 gold staters [to the goddess], with the approval of kings and other [Greeks] to whom they sent ambassadors, who voted by nation and city to honour Artemis and to make inviolable the city and country of Magnesia etc.

Parker has pertinently asked, “Is it so important that the practice of claiming ‘crowned’ or ‘isopythic’ status for the festival had apparently not yet emerged in the fourth century?”⁴⁶ “Crowned” is a pregnant term when it is contrasted with something that implies “not crowned”; but isopythic honours are more significant. For the word implies that a complex system of acceptance and recognition is in place, one that was

⁴⁶ Parker, in Schlesier and Zellmann, *Mobility* 13, criticizing Robert. While accepting Parker's central thesis that the Hellenistic development of the status-titulature of festivals was more complex than allowed by Robert, we may perhaps query whether “the status of ‘crowned games’ long remained a sharply defined one” (12).

ancient and known from the Olympia and Pythia, and until that system is formally in place, there is no guarantee that a victor of a stephanitic festival gets anything at all in his home town for winning at games outside the original four great games. Certainly *theoroi* by themselves cannot guarantee anything, and Parker is quite correct to criticize Robert for making *theoroi* the principal criterion for establishing crowned games.⁴⁷ It is indeed perfectly possible to have *theoroi* to festivals without games of any kind, or to festivals with games that are not stephanitic.⁴⁸ Nor do any other of the Hellenistic terms have the panhellenic precision we should like to discover. Earlier at the Athenian Panathenaea⁴⁹ gold crowns, some in the form of olive leaves plus cash, were awarded indiscriminately; but such awards are never mentioned in public utterance in Hellenistic times, since in the current ideology after 300 B.C. they were considered to be incompatible with the status of a crowned festival. This does not mean that they did not exist: one does not in public documents speak of embarrassing realities that undermine ideal claims. Nicolas Purcell speaks well of the “shamelessly bogus” in ancient culture,⁵⁰ and in a sense that is true of the complex attitude to these Hellenistic crowns, whose significance we shall discuss in greater detail elsewhere. The first unambiguous reference to (extra) prizes (*epathla*) awarded at a sacred festival seems to be in the regulations of the Sebasta of Naples in imperial times.⁵¹

Nonetheless prizes and money are serious matters for competitors. (One can hardly accept that Hellenistic victors were nobly content with only a crown of vegetation and what they

⁴⁷ To Parker’s examples of early games with *theoroi* not known to be crowned (Asklepieia of Epidauros, Heraia of Argos), we can add the Panathenaea of Athens.

⁴⁸ Vial, in Probst, *L’Orient* 324, cites annual *theoroi* from Tralles to the Didymeia, *Delphinion* 143.9–10.

⁴⁹ J. L. Shear, “Prizes from Athens: the List of Panathenaic Prizes and the Sacred Oil,” *ZPE* 142 (2003) 87–108.

⁵⁰ N. Purcell, “Fixity,” in Schlesier and Zellmann, *Mobility* 73–83, at 82, on “claim” versus “reality.”

⁵¹ *I.Olympia* 56 with the supplements proposed by various scholars summarized in *SEG* XXXVII 356.

might pick up from betting or a victory round.) If all one gets from the festival city is a vegetal crown, then one will need to be sure in advance—as Olympic and Pythian victors doubtless were—that one is going to get something from the home city. This is a system full of flaws for the upgrading of stephanitic festivals, and will need correction and intervention. At some point—and this not surprisingly seems to coincide exactly with the great diadochic kingships—it becomes possible to expect that the home town provide a prize equivalent to those of the four major festivals. Robert dated this to the arrival of the words isopythic and isolympic, i.e. with the Ptolemaia around 280, a “turning point.”⁵² So what are these isopythic *timai* that are voted to the victor in his home town, and for which the Magnesians had lobbied? It is often said that the stephanitic victor in his home city was given *sitesis* and *eiselasis*.⁵³ The first is very likely and cheap, the second occasionally possible, and Cassius Dio⁵⁴ can still use *sitesis* as the defining criterion for a sacred contest. But it depends upon what the home city had decreed, for it is difficult to think that every city signed on to accept all the rapidly multiplying would-be crowned festivals of all other cities for every competition for all ranks and for all times, if major expenditure was involved. There is moreover a discreet silence about the details of these generic honours in the inscriptions. They are called *philanthropa*, *athla*, *timai*, and other obscurantist words, though the rare *siteresia* is more significant.

⁵² So Parker, in Schlesier and Zellmann, *Mobility* 15. The Asklepieia of Epidauros or the Eleusinia or other fourth-century festivals are not strictly comparable, because we have no knowledge that their *theoroi* invited cities to the competitions of the festival (they invited to the god in the early inscriptions) or that these festivals were isopythic or the equivalent.

⁵³ Suet. *Nero* 25 says that it is the custom for victors—like Nero—to enter through a breach in the wall. This is manifestly untrue. Trajan famously created a special category of eiselastic games by *inter alia* offering subsidies of *obsonia* from a special fund: Plin. *Ep.* 10.118 and 119, whence the importance of listing “eiselastic” games in imperial inscriptions.

⁵⁴ Dio 51.1. Evidence for earlier stephanitic cash prizes: J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (AbhLeip 63.2 [Berlin 1972]) 10–11 and 255, none certain. *Prohedria* as prize: Xenophanes fr.2; *sitesis*: IG I³ 131 (with other honours).

We therefore conclude with two reflections on the prizes available to victors of crowned Hellenistic games, one from the festival city and one from the home city; we specifically exclude the vexed problem of imperial crowns and awards.⁵⁵ The word *brabeion* becomes the regular term for a prize in the first century A.D., and is very rare before that. But even in Illyrian Apollonia, which was under Roman influence from 229 B.C., an important festival for the Nymphs of the bitumen springs was called sometimes *Numphaia* but also ca. 125 B.C. “Brabeia of the Nymphs,” considered “sacred” at least by the later second century;⁵⁶ and this name should indicate the prizes, for which title we could compare the Argive *Aspis*. But at the Pythian games in the mid third century the victors were also awarded a *brabeion*, and Robert compared in particular a second-century inscription of Priene, which if complete might have solved our problem.⁵⁷ Since the word, extremely common in imperial

⁵⁵ This puts us in conflict with our referee, who wishes for more imperial data. The hundreds of references to the word *brabeion* in imperial texts—now easily available via the TLG—show that no specific item is meant, but only the general term “prize, award,” be it a symbol like a massive prize-crown or palm branch or the radiate solar crown or gilded apples or cylinder shown with horses or simply a bag of cash. An investigation would have to be archaeological, as one can see from J. Rumscheid, *Kranz und Krone: zu Insignien Siegespreisen und Ehrenzeichen der römischen Kaiserzeit* (IstForsch 23 [Tübingen 2000]); but at this time no clear terminological picture emerges from epigraphy or philology. K. Dunbabin is working on this subject.

⁵⁶ *IG* II² 3147 and Addenda 3149a (late II B.C.). L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* (Rome 1953) p.131, citing *I.Délos* 1957 (*Numphaia* only) and S. Dow, *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 88. One cannot rule out Roman influence, and imperial *brabeia* are usually associated with Rome. At the reorganized thematic Leonideia at Sparta ca. 100 A.D. the *epathla* (*IG* V.1 18.8) are cash prizes, now doubled, while the mysterious *brabeia* (19.4)—if different, possibly symbols of victory?—are given to victors by the *athlothetai*, and further cash supplements are given to victors for statues.

⁵⁷ Robert returned several times to the question of *brabeion*, lastly and most fully in *CRAI* 1982, 264 = *OMS* V 827. The files in the Fonds Robert show that Robert was overwhelmed by the confusing philological data, and he never came to a conclusion, beyond drawing attention to the now well-known massive prize crowns, on which D. Salzmann promises a monograph: “Kaiserzeitliche Denkmäler mit Preiskronen,” *Stadion* 24 (1998) 89–

agonistic language, means there “award” or “prize” or any symbol thereof, it is important to define what this rare Hellenistic usage might mean.⁵⁸

The Priene inscription (*I.Priene* 118.8–11) honours a benefactor who as agonothete had the *brabeia* for the use of unnamed local games reworked to be as secure as possible out of superior metal (*korinthiourgia*):

[σπεύδων δὲ --- τοῖς νικήσασιν ὥς]
 ἀσφαλέστατα πρὸς πάντα τὸν χρόνον γενηθῆναι τὰ βραβ[εῖα] πρὸς
 μὲν τὸ τῆς ἐπα[-----, τῆς]
 δὲ δαπάνης ὑπεράνω γενόμενος συνετέλεσεν κορινθίου[ργ]ᾶ βραβεῖα
 καὶ [----- κα]-
 λῶς κατασκευασμένα καὶ πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἀγῶνων χρείας ἀσφαλῶς
 γεγο[νότα, καθὼς καὶ -- γενομέ]-
 νου τοῦ ἀγῶνος φανερόν ἐγενήθη, καὶ προσεδάπησεν μετὰ τῶν
 συναγ[ωνοθετῶν δραχμὰς ----]

One thinks perhaps of the expensive gold crowns of the victors at some Panathenaic competitions in the form of olive leaves, but that does not explain why security is the issue, for the word *asphales* is repeated. If the Athenaia of Priene are the reference, then these would have been considered sacred at least in Priene;⁵⁹ but other games could be meant. The inference from the text is rather that the previous metalwork was inferior and he had them made of superior workmanship to last longer, indeed “for all time.” The further implication is, then, that these specific awards reverted to the city after the competition, and did not become the property of the victor, and were to be

99 with illustrations, which could now be easily supplemented. But these are not attested until ca. 160 A.D. and are irrelevant to this article.

⁵⁸ We have searched every example in the TLG, a considerable task since the word appears in the New Testament. As an example of the wider general confusion, one may note Pausanias 8.48.2, who tells us that a palm (*phoinix*) is the *stephanos* in most contests, and is everywhere put into the right hand of the victor. The many depictions show us that his *stephanos* is in fact not a “garland” but the regular palm branch. *Stephanos*, like *time*, or—in our view—*brabeion*, has lost any precise meaning. On this “Ehrenbezeugung” see already F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesen* (Leipzig 1909) 430–431.

⁵⁹ So L. and J. Robert, *Claros* 20.

used for the next festival. Though not completely certain, that seems also the deduction to be drawn from a list of expenditures on the Pythian preparations of the mid-third century. Amidst the many repairs and constructions undertaken for the Pythian festival occurs the following item: τὰ βραβεῖα Πλείστιος μνᾶν αἰγι[ναίαν].⁶⁰ The provision of 70 Aeginetan dr. (roughly 115 attic dr.) for prizes made the Roberts observe:⁶¹ “A Delphes, au milieu du III^e siècle, il doit s’agir de *brabeia* en bronze, d’où leur prix.” The small sum could not possibly be for more than the crafting or repairing of prizes, and one must observe that relatively minor repair and refurbishment is the tenor of the entire inscription. The sum cannot be for actual provision of silver or gold; one remembers that most prizes in a minor Tanagran competition ca. 80 B.C. are each worth over 115 dr., while manufacturing the 16 gold crowns apart from the cost of the gold cost only 46 dr.⁶² For the provision by repair of the larger number of honorary awards at Delphi, 115 dr. would be reasonable. Once again these seem to be metal objects that are given to the victors as tokens of victory, and if we are right that the cost of the material is not included, but repairs are, then they will have been retained by the Delphians. The famous Delphian gilded apples⁶³ are not actually attested until the first century A.D., but serve perhaps as a warning not to assume that these Hellenistic *brabeia* must have been in the form of metal crowns or palm branches. It is extraordinary that in the large number of epigraphic testimonies to Delphic awards, the word never appears again; but for our purposes

⁶⁰ *CID* II 139, esp. line 40; J. Pouilloux, “Travaux à Delphes à l’occasion des Pythia: les comptes de Dion 247,” *Études Delphiques* (*BCH* Suppl. 4 [1977]) 103–123, esp. 121: “Pleistios reçoit une mine éginétique pour la fourniture des prix—naturellement à Delphes les concours sont stéphanites. On fait préparer les couronnes pour les prix. La somme de 35 statères [i.e. one aeginetan mna] paraît élevée pour les seules fournitures.” This is not correct.

⁶¹ *Bull. épigr.* 1977, 236.

⁶² W. J. Slater, “Three Questions on the History of Drama,” *Phoenix* 47 (1993) 189–212.

⁶³ Robert, *OMS* VI 709–719; F. Queyrel, “Inscriptions et scènes figurées peintes,” *BCH* 125 (2001) 333–387.

here what is certain is that these are not cash prizes,⁶⁴ and neither are they crowns of laurel. If pressed, we would suggest as a hypothesis that they were metal symbols of victory like palm branches which the victors would be given in their right hand upon victory and could carry formally during the victory ceremony.

The second piece of evidence has to our knowledge not been exploited, though it was part of a fine analysis by Robert⁶⁵ (*I.Ephesos* 1415, II B.C.):

[ἔδοξ]εν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳι· Νεῦμος Ἐνδρονίκου [εἶ]-
 [πεν· ἔπε]ιδὴ Ἀθηνόδωρος Σήμονος ἰσοτελῆς ὦγ καὶ κατοι-
 [κῶν] ἐν Ἐφέσῳι νενίκηκεν τὰ Νέμεα παίδας πύκτιν
 [καὶ ἀνα]γγελεῖς Ἐφέσιος ἐστεφάνωκε τὴν πόλιν,
 [ἔδοξε]ν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳι· εἶναι Ἀθηνόδωρον
 [Σήμον]ος Ἐφέσιον καθάπερ ἀνήγγελεται ἐν τῶι ἀγῶνι,
 [καὶ ὑπά]ρχειν Ἀθηνοδώρῳι τὰς τιμὰς τὰς τεταγμέ-
 νας ἐν τῶι νόμῳι τῶι νικῶντι παῖδας τῶι σώματι
 [Ν]έμεα, καὶ ἀναγγεῖλαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῆι ἀγορᾷ καθ[ά]-
 περ οἱ ἄλλοι νικῶντες ἀναγγέλλονται· τὸν δὲ οἱ[κονό]-
 μον ἀποδοῦναι Ἀθηνοδώρῳι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου τετ[α]-
 [γμ]ένον ἀργύριον εἰς τὸν στέφανον· ἐπικληρῶσ[αι δὲ]
 αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς φυλῆν καὶ χιλιαστύν· ἔλαχε φυλῆ[ν]
 [Κα]ρρηαῖος, χιλιαστὺν Χηλώνεος.

The boule and people decreed: Neumos s. of Andronikos proposed: whereas Athenodoros s. of Semon being of equal rights and dwelling in Ephesos has won the Nemean games in boys' boxing and being proclaimed as Ephesian has crowned the city, the city and people decree: Athenodoros is to be an Ephesian, as he was proclaimed in the contest, and there are to be for Athenodoros the honours that are authorized by law for the victor in boys' corporeal events in the Nemea; and to proclaim him in the

⁶⁴ A particularly fine example of the insouciance with which Greek competitions of the imperial period regarded cash and crowns is provided by a new mosaic from Pozzuoli, where the oversize (metal) prize crown for the Eusebeia has a moneybag on top, marked CL, illustrated in C. Gialanella, "Il mosaico con lottatori da una villa del suburbio orientale di Puteoli," *AISCOM* 8 (2001) 599–608. This would be a *brabeion* plus *epathlon* perhaps.

⁶⁵ *OMS* V 354–367; surprisingly he did not comment on precisely the words that interest us. The example has escaped Pleket, *Nikephoros* 17 (2004) 77–89.

agora as the other victors are proclaimed; the financial manager is to give Athenodoros the money that is authorized by law for the crown; and to allot him a tribe and chiliastus.

Athenodoros had himself declared as Ephesian when he won at the Nemean games ca. 300 B.C. The Ephesians in awarding him citizenship applied to him the laws governing their own citizens who had won stephanitic games "with the body." (Presumably the local awards were different in non-physical sport.) He is to be proclaimed in the agora; but he is to be awarded "the money legally authorized for the crown." Clearly therefore a victor was given an amount in cash here as a result of a stephanitic victory; the amount, being authorized already, does not need to be stated. There is a small ambiguity, since it could be that Athenodoros was given money to buy himself a crown sc. of gold, and of course this would still amount to cash. But in that case we might have expected this award to be put differently, e.g. that he was to be given a crown, and the treasurer was to pay. The straightforward reading is preferable, viz. that the crown is the Nemean one already mentioned. The inscription gives us proof that a victor was given a cash award, and even in this case could choose the home city which would give it to him; and we can justifiably assume that Ephesos would produce higher iso-nemic rewards than most cities. There was room here for profiteering by victorious athletes who wished to acquire citizenships. But it is evident that we only know incidentally of this cash payment because of the extraordinary circumstances of the victory.

We conclude that Hellenistic stephanitic games required a complex infrastructure of inter-city acceptances that made prizes, including perhaps principally cash prizes, the responsibility of the home city and not the festival city; they were not standardized, and they might constitute a considerable burden for cities that issued many isopythic acceptances. Victors apparently also obtained from the festival city *brabeia* as well as the *stephanoi*, but on our present evidence these were not cash, and were honorary awards which might be temporary. Yet a final caveat is in order: if a city establishing a stephanitic competition did offer additional cash or a cash equivalent such as a gold crown (*ἔπαθλον*) or second and third cash prizes, it would

never publicize these for our information, since that would implicitly assert that its festival was not isolympic or isopythic.⁶⁶

July, 2006

McMaster University
slaterw@mcmaster.ca

Inscriptiones Graecae
summa@bbaw.de

⁶⁶ This article results from long-distance cooperation between D. Summa working in Berlin and W. J. Slater. Summa is responsible for the epigraphical detail, making and checking the squeeze and the stone; she wishes to thank especially Fr. Dr. Sylvia Brehme of the Antikensammlung Berlin for permission for photos and squeezes. Slater wrote most of the draft, based on a seminar at Cornell University; he expresses his gratitude to Robert Parker and Mat Carbon for the opportunity to present his findings at an epigraphical workshop in Oxford in January 2006. Kent Rigsby is thanked for his generous encouragement and corrections, not for the first time. A careful referee rightly enjoined both excision and precision.