

SEATING AND SPECTACLE IN THE GRAECO-ROMAN WORLD

SEATING AND SPECTACLE
IN THE GRAECO-ROMAN WORLD

By
TAMARA JONES, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

© Copyright by Tamara Jones, August 2008

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2008)
(Classics)

McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Seating and Spectacle in the Graeco-Roman World

AUTHOR: Tamara A. Jones, B.A. (University of Guelph), M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Evan W. Haley

NUMBER OF PAGES: iv, 384

Abstract

This dissertation examines the organization of audiences in spectacular venues (theatres, amphitheatres, stadia, and odea) throughout the Graeco-Roman world. The arrangements in Rome are discussed but the main focus is the organization of spectators in Italian and provincial venues, revealed through inscriptions found on the seats themselves indicating for which individual or group the seat or area was reserved. Included with this dissertation is a catalogue of seating inscriptions from venues throughout the empire, the first to be compiled. This study compares provincial communities within the same region, across regions, and also with Rome. Topics discussed include to what extent legislation passed in Rome influenced seating outside of the city, the contrast between the display in the theatre of the egalitarian ideology of classical Athens and the display of the hierarchically-based Roman ideology, the different uses of venues as they are revealed by seating inscriptions, and the relationship of spectacular venues to the power of the Roman emperor and the ways in which this power was negotiated in the East.

Spectacular venues, in which members of the local population as well as visitors were present, were ideal locations for the display of the local social hierarchy. This display was one that was, at least in the western regions of the empire, influenced to a certain degree by legislation passed in Rome but it was also influenced by the desires of the local elite throughout the empire who were responsible for the grant of reserved seats. The organization of spectacular audiences thus not only reflected the disparate social and civic structures of individual communities, but also projected an idealized vision created by those in charge of seating arrangements. Local inhabitants could, through their attendance at spectacles, determine their place within the ideal community on display.

Acknowledgements

I owe an immeasurable debt of thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Evan Haley, from whose knowledge and support I benefited greatly. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Alexandra Retzleff and Dr. Claude Eilers, for their involvement from the beginning with this research project. I would not have been able to complete the thesis without the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and of McMaster University. I am very grateful for the support of friends and family, in particular Robin Soloy, Juanita Elford, Alexandra Holbrook, Lora-Lee Lawson, Fiona Jones, and Betty Ann Jones. I would like to dedicate this thesis to my father, Dennis Guy Jones, to my grandmother, Gwendolyn Ione Jones, and to the memory of my grandfather, Guy Oswald Jones.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter 1 – Rome	6
Chapter 2 – Italy and the Latin Provinces.....	50
Chapter 3 – The Greek Provinces	102
Chapter 4 – The Social Organization of Audiences Throughout the Empire	162
Conclusion	226
Catalogue of Seating Inscriptions	246
Bibliography	358

Introduction

The grant of preferred seating at spectacles to individuals or groups of individuals was a practice adapted by Roman culture from Greek culture, in particular that of classical Athens, a *polis* which privileged magistrates, priests, and other important state officials with seats at the front of venues (Chapter 3). Reserved seating was a tool used by the Romans in the same fashion, to bestow upon an individual or a group the honour of public recognition in a venue in which a large number of people gathered. The senators and the equestrians, the two upper *ordines* or strata of Roman society, were at different times in the Republic granted seats at the very front and near the very front of the theatre audience respectively (Chapter 1). To a greater extent than had the Athenians, the Romans used reserved seating not only as a privilege but also as a way to keep each element of society in its own particular place. Roman society was heavily stratified and the auditorium (*cavea*) of a spectacular edifice, with its different levels of seating demarcated by walls and walkways, was the perfect venue in which not only to display but also reinforce this hierarchy. Shortly after the end of the Republic Augustus created a detailed seating plan for the theatre in the city of Rome, using reserved seating to emphasize the elevated status of groups such as the senators and equestrians and the low status of others, such as women and slaves. The organization of the Roman audience was not, however, merely a reflection of the existing social structure. Motivated by his own personal and political desires, Augustus honoured elements of society important to his social programme, including married men, who did not in and of themselves exist on a distinct level of the social hierarchy. Augustus used

seating arrangements to reinforce the manner in which he wanted the Roman social hierarchy to be structured not only to the inhabitants of the city themselves but also to those who visited it. His seating policies were to be modified only slightly by the emperors who followed him.

Audience organization was a concern not only in the city of Rome but also throughout the empire. Although limited to a certain extent by seating legislation passed in the capital, Italian and western communities were able to structure their audiences as the local elite, responsible for the arrangements, saw fit (Chapter 2). In the Greek East the tradition of reserved seating worked in conjunction with Roman influence (Chapter 3). While seats in provincial venues had to be reserved for visiting senators and in some cases equestrians, the council of each town – the *ordo decurionum* in the West and the βουλή in the East – was assigned seats in privileged areas of the local audience in recognition of its importance. Because each community was able to control the organization of local audiences and grant seats to those individuals or groups deemed important, spectator arrangements varied from town to town, region to region, and province to province. Although these variations reflect the discrepant social and civic structures of communities throughout the empire, they can also provide insight into the creation or reinforcement of a local self-identity within these communities. Audience organization in the provinces was not merely a reflection of the existing social structure but was also a static display of the idealized society which each community wished to exhibit. As opposed to in Rome, where the society on display was designed for visitors and local inhabitants, in the provinces the display appears to have been primarily designed for the local population.

The focus of this dissertation is the study of seating arrangements as they are presented by inscriptions found on the seats of spectacular venues – theatres, odea, amphitheatres, and stadia – throughout the Graeco-Roman empire, particularly in the provinces. Chapter 1 focusses on seating in the city of Rome itself, the evidence for which is almost entirely literary, providing a point of comparison for the evidence from the provinces. Chapter 2 focusses on Italy and the West and Chapter 3 on the East, and it is in these areas that the evidence comprises seating inscriptions almost exclusively. Chapter 4 provides a synthetic discussion of the trends, similarities, and differences found in audience organization throughout the empire and examines what spectator arrangements reveal about the social and civic environment of individual communities both within and outside of spectacular venues.

The seating inscriptions upon which this study is based, carved in both Greek and Latin on the seats of venues throughout the empire, are compiled in the accompanying catalogue, the first such major collection of these texts. They consist generally of names, whether of an individual or of a group of individuals, or of the title of an office which is sometimes accompanied by the name of the individual holding it. These names or titles either stand alone or are accompanied by what are referred to in this work as reservation terms or reservation formulae, Greek or Latin nouns, prepositions, or verbs which indicate that the seat is reserved. Inscriptions of a fragmentary nature or those consisting of abbreviated names are included in the catalogue but have not been translated. The majority of the texts date to the Imperial period, in some cases to the late Empire (such as the factional seating inscriptions), but certain texts date to

the Augustan period or perhaps earlier.

The catalogue of seating inscriptions accompanying this dissertation could not have been completed without the efforts of previous scholars. Early research on this topic was carried out by E. Hübner (Rome and the provinces), P. Delattre (Carthage), E. Fabricius and C. Schuchhardt (Pergamum), and R. Heberdey (Ephesus).¹ A most valuable recent resource is the series *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'occidente romano*, volumes one through six. Volume six, a compilation of all the inscriptions from the Flavian amphitheatre, many of which are seating inscriptions, is of particular value.² The release of new volumes is awaited with interest.

Many inscriptions from the West are found scattered throughout the volumes of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (CIL)*. Individual studies that were available include those of E. Gose on the theatre of Altbachtal/Trier, A. Maiuri on the amphitheatre of Puteoli, F. Miltner on the two amphitheatres of Carnuntum, A. Ventura Villanueva on the theatre of Córdoba, J.L. Ramírez Sádaba on the amphitheatre of Mérida, R. Corzo Sánchez on the amphitheatre of Italica, G. Alföldy on the theatre and amphitheatre of Tarraco, and R. Wiegels on the theatre of Lopodunum.³ For the eastern empire the majority of the inscriptions were gathered from individual works rather than epigraphic corpora, the main exceptions being the inscriptions from the theatre of Dionysus in Athens found in *Inscriptiones Graecae (IG)*, those from the theatre of Bostra found in *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie (IGLSyr)*, and those from the theatre

¹ Hübner 1858; Delattre 1898; Fabricius and Schuchhardt 1902; Heberdey et al. 1912.

² Orlandi 2004.

³ Miltner 1933; Maiuri 1955; Gose 1972; Alföldy 1975; Corzo Sánchez 1994b; Ramírez Sádaba

of Termessus in *Tituli Asiae Minoris (TAM)*.⁴ The following studies were of immeasurable use for the East: C. Roueché on the venues of Aphrodisias, Z. Borkowski on factional inscriptions in Alexandria, Y. Magen on the theatre of Nablus, A. Rehm on the epigraphy of Didyma, A. Retzleff and A.M. Mjely on the odeon of Gerasa, S. Agusta-Boularot and J. Seigne on the same venue, F. Kolb on the inscriptions from the theatre of Hierapolis and the stadium of Saïttai, P. Herrmann on the epigraphy of Miletus, and B. Saria on the theatre of Stobi.⁵ Extensive use has also been made of J.P. Golvin's work on amphitheatres, D. de Bernardi Ferrero's work on theatres in Asia Minor, and F. Sear's recent work on Roman theatres.⁶

The abbreviations of journals and epigraphic corpora used in the dissertation follow the standards of the *American Journal of Archaeology*; an abbreviation not provided by that journal is *EAOR* = *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'occidente romano*. The abbreviations of the names and works of ancient authors follow those in the third edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.

1994; Ventura Villanueva 1999; Wiegels 2000.

⁴ *IG* II 3² 5025-5164; *IGLSyr* XIII 9156-9166; *TAM* 3.1 872.

⁵ Saria 1940; Rehm 1958; Kolb 1974, 1990; Borkowski 1981; Magen 1984; Herrmann 1998; Roueché 1993; Agusta-Boularot and Seigne 2004; Retzleff and Mjely 2004.

⁶ de Bernardi Ferrero 1966-1974; Golvin 1988; Sear 2006.

Chapter 1 - Rome

Roman society was based upon a strict social hierarchy. By the early empire this hierarchy comprised the senatorial order, the equestrian order, and the *plebs* in the city of Rome, and the decurional order and the *plebs* in the Italian and western provincial cities. The main body of the Hellenized eastern communities, the βουλή, was the focus of some changes under the Romans which resulted in the creation of a new curial class.¹ The importance of social order to the Romans is clear through the political and juridical privileges and positions granted to senators, equestrians, and decurions, the particular dress and insignia of these *ordines* which distinguished them not only from the mass of the *plebs* but from each other, and the social privileges bestowed upon these orders such as the assignation of special seats at spectacles. Organization in spectacular venues throughout the empire, most clearly expressed through reserved seating, was of particular concern to the Romans since this hierarchically-based seating system allowed the prestige of a group or of an individual to be visible to, and clearly defined for, the public. Reserved seating not only emphasized the elevated status of the upper *ordines* but also the low status of groups such as women and slaves. Audience organization was a tool used by the political leaders of Rome to create a static, public display of the social hierarchy, a display that did not necessarily only reflect society as it was, but also as it had been constructed by those in charge. In Rome the society on display in the theatre and amphitheatre reinforced the leaders', and in particular Augustus', ideological values not only to the local population but also to

visitors.

Seating at spectacles in Rome

Although senators and equestrians were granted reserved seats during the Republic as an indication of their elevated social status, it was not until the *lex Iulia theatralis* of Augustus that audiences in Rome were organized in a detailed manner meant to reflect an idealized version – according to Augustus – of Roman society.

The Republic

The practice of bestowing preferred seating, *prohedria*, upon individuals or groups of individuals was adapted by Roman culture from Greek culture, the majority of the evidence for which comes from classical Athens. In Athens *prohedria* was granted to magistrates, priests, and other important individuals or groups; in Rome it was granted to the senators, equestrians, and other groups of individuals important to the state.² The elevated social status of the upper *ordines* of Roman society manifested itself in the privilege of reserved seating at spectacles; the lower status of groups such as women and slaves was reinforced by their location in the audience, near the back of the venue. A striking visual representation of the idealized Roman social order, the arrangement of spectators at spectacles acted to display and therefore, as a result, reinforce the strict hierarchy.

¹ For Italy and the West see Chapter 2; for the eastern provinces see Chapter 3.

² See Chapter 3 for seating in classical Athens; for discussion of the role of theatre in Greek society see Longo (1990); Ober and Strauss (1990); Padel (1990); Scully (1999).

In 194 B.C.E., before permanent stone theatres were erected in Rome, senators were granted the right to sit separately from the rest of the audience; whether immediately or at a later date their seats were placed in the orchestra.³ The ancient sources disagree upon the exact context of this grant. In his commentary on Cicero's *Pro Cornelio* Asconius gives three accounts: first, that it took place at the *ludi votivi* on the initiative of Scipio and his consular colleague,⁴ second, that it took place at the *ludi Megalenses* with the approval of Scipio,⁵ and finally that it took place on the orders of the censors at the *ludi Romani* with no involvement by Scipio.⁶ By the time of Augustus at the latest, senators were seated on low backless benches called *subsellia* (although the term can also refer to seats in general) which were placed on broad, flat steps in the orchestra.⁷ While the senators were pleased with their seats since they were a public representation of their elevated social status, according to Livy the general populace thought that the visible separation of the senators from the rest of the audience members was damaging to feelings of freedom and social harmony.⁸

The prologue to Plautus' *Poenulus* appears to reflect this new arrangement in the theatre.

First the *prologus*, acting as an *imperator histricus*, orders the audience members *in subselliis* to

³ The senators also had specific seating arrangements in the Curia and in the temples where they met, where they were seated according to status and experience; see Taylor (1969).

⁴ Asc. 70C.

⁵ Asc. 70C; cf. Val. Max. 2.4.3; Livy 34.54.8.

⁶ Asc. 69C; cf. Livy 34.44.4-5, 34.54.4-7. These varying accounts are most likely due to the changing attitudes towards Scipio and whether it was appropriate for the authors to extol or to deny his prestige (Wiseman 1973, 195). Gruen (1992, 203-204) argues that it would have been appropriate for Scipio to endorse such legislation as a public reassertion of the importance of the *nobiles*.

⁷ Parker 1999, 164.

⁸ Livy 34.54.6.

sit quietly (the precise meaning of *subsellia* here is unclear), revealing that at least some of the spectators are seated; as he continues, however, it becomes clear that this is not the case for all audience members.⁹ He orders the *dissignator* not to show anyone to a seat when the actors have begun to perform, but rather to leave them standing.¹⁰ Slaves are told to leave room for free individuals, to pay their manumission price, or to leave, which seems to be a joke since slaves were usually allowed to attend the theatre.¹¹ The *prologus* then goes on to order the children to stop crying and the women to stop talking.¹²

There seems to be a contradiction here: seats were presumably available for the latecomers whom the *dissignator* was apparently not to lead in, but there were not enough seats for all who wanted them (as implied by the order to slaves to stand). This can be explained by the suggestion that the *Poenulus* was first produced after the senators had been assigned separate seating in 194 B.C.E.¹³ T.J. Moore argues that although the *prologus* commands those who slept in to stand he is referring to those individuals, senators, who had seats reserved for them (since

⁹ Plaut. *Poen.* ll 5-10; see Beare (1939) for an early argument in favour of the existence of seats in the Plautine theatre.

¹⁰ ll 19-22. Moore (1994, 116) believes that the office of *dissignator* was created to enforce the new seating arrangements. The position of *dissignator* was important enough to be mentioned in epitaphs (for example *CIL* II²7.345; *AE* 2000, 495); see also Chapter 2 for this position and its Greek equivalent.

¹¹ ll 23-25. Although Cicero (*Har. resp.* 26) suggests that slaves were forbidden to attend theatrical performances at festivals, Rawson (1987, 87-88) and Moore (1994, 116-117) argue that this prohibition does not refer to all festivals and may in fact only imply that slaves were banned from the seats as opposed to the entire theatre. Moore (1994, 117) also adds that while Cicero (*Har. resp.* 26) states that it was the task of the *praeco* to remove the slaves, the *praeco* has already been at work in the *Poenulus* (ll 11-15) and the slaves still remain in the theatre.

¹² ll 28-35. Slater (2000, 155) points out that the *prologus* objects early on to the noise of the *lictor* but he soon moves on to safer victims for his commands, slaves, children, and women. He suggests that the orders of the *prologus* are made less offensive to the audience by being directed at the minority and the powerless of the spectators.

only these individuals were led in by the *dissignator*), and that he is making a joke at the senators' expense.¹⁴ The audience would therefore have been divided into three sections: the area reserved for the senators with many available seats – whether in the orchestra or on wooden seats is unclear (although individuals of particular importance may have been seated on *sellae curules*)¹⁵ – and watched over by the *dissignator*, the remaining theatre seats that were too few for the entire audience, and the area in the back of the theatre in which those individuals without a seat were forced to stand. The competition for seats clearly had nothing to do with time of arrival since the *prologus* commands the slaves who were already present at the theatre to stay at the back and not to attempt to sit. It was instead dependent upon social status; audience members of the lowest social standing, especially slaves, were denied a seat in order that latecomers of a higher social status could sit.¹⁶ Although the *Poenulus* is a comedy, this prologue can be seen as indication of the social reality of the theatre in the early second century B.C.E.

The back of the theatre was the location of lowest prestige, occupied by slaves and free individuals who were denied a seat by the arrival of latecomers with more wealth and status.¹⁷ A statement of Valerius Maximus reveals in what low regard the area at the back of the theatre was held.¹⁸ A former senator (he had been removed from the *ordo* by the censors) watching a

¹³ Moore 1994, 115-116.

¹⁴ Moore 1994, 116.

¹⁵ Dio Cass. 48.31.3 provides a later example; Schäfer (1989) offers a useful discussion of the *sella curulis*.

¹⁶ Moore 1994, 116. For further references to the social status of the seated audience members in Plautus, see *Poen.* 1224; *Capt.* 1-3, 10-16; *Amph.* 64-68.

¹⁷ Moore 1994, 117.

¹⁸ Val. Max. 4.5.1.

production in the farthest section of the theatre was forced by all present to move to a place appropriate to his standing, presumably closer to the stage. The area between the stage, also an area of low prestige, and the back of the theatre was divided after 194 into seating for the senators and for the audience members who were not forced to stand.¹⁹ Those members of the audience who had been able to sit in the theatre before 194 would have been visibly superior to their social inferiors who were forced to stand; the addition of senatorial seats added a third level to the social hierarchy since the senators were now visibly superior to those seated behind them. Moore suggests that the area reserved for senators was more than large enough to accommodate those who did in fact choose to attend the theatre, thereby reducing the number of seats available for other audience members and forcing some citizens of lower social status who had previously been able to sit to stand.²⁰ His suggestion implies that the senatorial seats were located in the *cavea* rather than in the orchestra; if their seats were in the orchestra the amount of space available to other audience members would in fact have increased. The visible separation of the senators and the guaranteed proximity of the new senatorial seats to the stage might have angered the general audience members regardless of whether they were in the orchestra.

The senate had been a feature of Roman public life from the beginning and by the time of Augustus was the official uppermost stratum of the Roman social hierarchy.²¹ According to

¹⁹ Parker 1999, 164. Actors were generally, although not always, slaves, freed, or individuals of low social standing; see the Conclusion for a discussion of their status.

²⁰ Moore 1994, 123.

²¹ For discussion of the Roman *ordines* and Roman social structure in general, see Rostovtzeff (1926); Gagé (1964); Béranger (1970); Michel (1970); Hopkins (1974); MacMullen (1974); Cohen (1975,

tradition Romulus chose one hundred men to form the first senate; they were thereafter chosen by the kings and then the consuls. By the time of the Gracchi the senate, in which membership was now permanent, comprised three hundred men, many of whom were ex-magistrates. Sulla expanded its number by another three hundred and made the quaestorship the office of entry. The census requirement for senators remained 400,000 sesterces (at which it had been set by the early first century B.C.E.) until the time of Augustus, when sometime between 18 and 13 B.C.E. he raised it to one million sesterces.²² He also reduced the number of senators, by now over one thousand, to six hundred, which was the size at which this body remained into the third century.²³

Membership in the senate was never hereditary but Augustus emphasized the expectation that sons of senators would follow the path chosen by their fathers.²⁴ Although in some ways he reinforced the elevated status of the *ordo senatorius*, Augustus nevertheless made it clear that he had become the new head of the social hierarchy.²⁵ Senators were visibly differentiated from the rest of the population by the *latus clavus* and special shoes, and were privileged juridically and socially with such honours as the front seats at spectacles.²⁶

1984); Nicolet (1984b); Alföldy (1985); Raaflaub (1986); Grant (1992); Treggiari (2002).

²² Augustus' changes to the senatorial census are recorded in Dio Cassius 54.17.3 and 54.26.3; he records 100,000 drachmae (400,000 sesterces) as the census amounts in 18 and 250,000 drachmae (one million sesterces) as the amount in 13/12 B.C.E..

²³ Dio Cass. 52.42, 54.13-14, 54.26.3. Caesar had adlected numerous individuals into the senate, and after his death others managed to be added through bribery and influence. He had also increased the number of quaestorships from 20 to 40 but Augustus returned it to the original 20; see Talbert (1984a, 55).

²⁴ Garnsey and Saller 1987, 113.

²⁵ See below.

²⁶ For further discussion of the senate see for example Etienne (1965b); Wiseman (1971); Shatzman (1975); D'Arms (1981, 48-71); Chastagnol (1984a, 1984b, 1992); Talbert (1984b). For the Augustan senate see for example Brunt (1984); Talbert (1984a); Eck (1990); Nicolet (1984a, 1990).

In the late Republic another body began to appear. A *plebiscitum equorum reddendorum* was passed circa 129 B.C.E. requiring all current, former, or future senators to return the *equus publicus*, a public horse for whose upkeep the state provided. This *plebiscitum* freed up three hundred horses which were then bestowed as an honorific status symbol upon the many wealthy individuals who were not in the cavalry; it was these individuals as well as those in the military who combined to form the equestrian order.²⁷ Another step in the separation of the senatorial and equestrian orders was Gaius Gracchus' exclusion of senators from the *repetundae* juries. The precise definition of an *eques Romanus* remains, however, an issue of debate in modern scholarship, with the requirements for admission to the *ordo* the central point of dispute. The narrow definition designates as an equestrian only an *eques equo publico*, an individual having received the public horse based on the necessary census requirement of 400,000 HS, free birth, and moral probity; the wider definition requires only the census qualification, free birth, and moral probity without possession of the public horse.²⁸ The source of these modern diverging opinions is the lack of clarity in ancient sources as well as apparent changes in the definition of an *eques Romanus* throughout Roman history.²⁹ In some cases it seems clear that the only equestrian was an *eques equo publico* whereas in others the nature of an *eques Romanus* is

²⁷ Cic. *Rep.* 4.2; Plut. *Vit. Pomp.* 22; see also Crawford (1978, 201); Alföldy (1985, 49).

²⁸ It is in Pliny's description (*NH* 33.32) of the *lex Iulia theatralis* that the census qualification for the equestrian order is first mentioned as being 400,000 sesterces; *infra* n. 108.

²⁹ Badian (1972, 84) calls the definition of the *ordo equester* a "nightmare or will-o'-the-wisp of modern scholarship."

ambiguous.³⁰ It also occurred on occasion that an individual could become an equestrian without the necessary qualifications. Caesar, Augustus, and later rulers bestowed equestrian status upon individuals whom they deemed worthy, including freedmen.³¹

From Augustus onwards the employment of *equites* in high-ranking governmental and military posts previously reserved for senators increased and by the third century equestrians held positions of higher responsibility than did senators, perhaps because they had more professional military experience and emperors thought their political loyalty more trustworthy.³² Unlike senatorial families, equestrian families were not able to maintain membership in the *ordo* over many generations.³³ Although in the third century it seemed that the *ordo equester* would eclipse the *ordo senatorius*, these two bodies amalgamated and the equestrian order eventually ceased to

³⁰ The *lex Aurelia* of 70 B.C.E. created *decuriae* of *tribuni aerarii* who were not *equites* (since they had a different *decuria*) and whom Asconius includes among the *plebs* but who Dio says were chosen *amplissimo ex censu*, that is from the equestrian census (Dio Cass. 43.25.2; Asc. 17C). Here then are a group of men who have the 400,000 HS census amount but who do not seem to be *equites*. Evidence for the same *lex*, however, also provides an argument for the wider definition since the *tribuni aerarii* are often referred to as *equites* in other ancient sources (Vell. Pat. 2.32.3; Plut. *Vit. Pomp.* 22.3; Cic. *Font.* 36; Cluent. 121; Flacc. 4.96). This seems to indicate that it was possible for men who had the census qualification but no other qualification (membership in the equestrian centuries, possession of the *equus publicus*) to be thought of as *equites*.

³¹ For the bestowal of equestrian rank upon imperial freedmen, see Suet. *Vit.* 12, and upon non-imperial freedmen see Dio Cass. 47.7.4-5; Suet. *Aug.* 27.2; Mart. 3.29, 11.37; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.143-145. A rare example of an imperial freedman being given the insignia of a senator occurred under Nero, who honoured his freedman Epaphroditus for his role in discovering the conspiracy of 65 C.E. For the bestowal of equestrian status on others see, for example, Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.80, 185, 187; Macrobi. *Sat.* 3.14; Philostr. *VS, Heliodorus* 626 (here the grant includes children although that was not usually the case); Sen. *Controv.* 7.3.9; Suet. *Iul.* 33 (Caesar's troops mistakenly thought he was granting them all equestrian status), 39.2; Dio Cass. 48.45.7-9.

³² Winspear and Geweke 1935, 106-112; Ville 1981, 99, 105-106; Brunt 1983, 42-43; Alföldy 1985, 164-168.

³³ Alföldy 1985, 123; Demougin 1993, 235.

exist as a separate entity.³⁴ Equestrians had their particular insignia, the *angustus clavus* and the gold ring, and although it was much later than the grant to senators they too were given the privilege of reserved seats at games.

The equestrian order was assigned the first fourteen rows in the theatre by the tribune Lucius Roscius Otho in his *lex Roscia theatralis* of 67 B.C.E.; the *lex* also reserved certain seats outside of these rows (known as the *XIV* or the *XVIII* in ancient sources) for *equites* who had become bankrupt through no fault of their own.³⁵ Later, however, Augustus declared that as long as an individual or his parents had ever possessed the equestrian census amount he had the right to sit in the equestrian rows.³⁶ It is unclear whether the *lex Roscia theatralis* was innovative or whether it reintroduced a previous law, perhaps of Gaius Gracchus, which had fallen into disuse or had been cancelled by Sulla. Cicero and Velleius both suggest that there was an original grant which was cancelled and then restored by Roscius, Asconius states that Roscius confirmed the

³⁴ Alföldy 1985, 193-200. For discussion of the *ordo equester*, see Stein (1927); Winspear and Geweke (1935, 105-106); Hill (1939); Henderson (1963); Pflaum (1965); Nicolet (1966); Wiseman (1970; 1973, 192-196); Badian (1972, 83-85); Hellegouarc'h (1972, 449-483); Millar (1977, 279-284); Crawford (1978, 200-201); Brunt (1983, 1988); Demougin (1988a, 1993, 1994a); Demougin et al. (1999).

³⁵ Cic. *Phil.* 2.18.44; *Mur.* 40; Livy *Epit. Per.* xcix; Asc. 79C; Plut. *Cic.* 13; Vell. *Pat.* 2.32.3; Juv. 3.159.

³⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 40.1. The *lex Roscia theatralis* originally applied only to the theatre, but it may have been extended to the amphitheatre by Augustus' *lex Iulia theatralis* (below) and then later to the Circus when Nero reserved what may have been the first fourteen rows for the equestrians in 63 C.E. (Tac. *Ann.* 15.32) (below). The *lex Roscia theatralis* is often used in attempts to determine the true nature of the *ordo equester* in terms of whether the number of *equites* who could have been seated in the first fourteen rows corresponds to the narrow or wide definition of the order. For discussion of the ancient testimony concerning the *lex* and its relationship to the *ordo equester*, see Henderson (1963, 62); Scamuzzi (1969a, 1969b, 1970a, 1970b); Wiseman (1970, 72, 80; 1973, 194-196); Badian (1972, 84); Pérez (1976, 438-440); Rawson (1987, 102-106); Brunt (1988, 146, 159); Demougin (1988a, 796-802). The *lex* does not in fact appear to provide concrete evidence for either side of the argument. Wiseman initially asserted that the fourteen rows were meant only for the *equites equo publico* since they were a fixed number (1970, 72), then

right of the fourteen rows, and Plutarch and Juvenal view Roscius as an innovator.³⁷ The comment of Asconius implies that Roscius made law what had previously been custom, thereby “restoring” to the *equites* the seating privilege which had been their due because of their wealth and dignity.³⁸ If this is the case then Roscius may be viewed as an innovator in some ancient sources because he was the first to enforce the right of the fourteen rows by law; the statement that he restored the dignity of the order does not necessarily suggest that an earlier, unattested grant was cancelled. There is no concrete evidence that the *equites* had reserved seats before the *lex Roscia theatralis* was passed and Roscius may have made law something that the *equites* alone thought they deserved.

The reservation of the first fourteen rows in the theatre for the *equites* would have reduced, if not the number of seats available to other audience members (since the *equites* presumably would previously have taken up almost the same number of seats but scattered throughout the audience), then the number of seats available near the stage. Just as the people were upset when the senators were granted separate seats, the same reaction was provoked by the *lex Roscia theatralis*. Upon entering the theatre during Cicero’s consulship in 63 B.C.E., Roscius was cheered by the *equites* but booed and hissed at by the majority of the audience.³⁹ The reservation of the first fourteen rows added a fourth level to the social hierarchy of the audience:

later reviewed his opinion and concluded that Roscius’ criterion must have been the census (1973, 195).

³⁷ Cic. *Mur.* 40; Vell. Pat. 2.32.3; Asc. 79C; Plut. *Vit. Cic.* 13; Juv. 3.159.

³⁸ Wiseman 1973, 195-196. He believes that a law reserving seats for the *equites* had not previously been passed because the aediles wanted to encourage popular support and a *lex* in favour of the equestrians would have had the opposite result.

the senators, the equestrians, the better-off members of the *plebs*, and the poorest free individuals and slaves. The social hierarchy inside the theatre reflected that outside since the *equites* were becoming an increasingly important *ordo*, and that importance was solidified by the grant of reserved seats. Seats were also reserved for tribunes of the *plebs* in the theatre, at the latest from 25 B.C.E. onward.⁴⁰

Since all male citizens who attended the theatre had to wear the toga, assigned seating also allowed the different levels of the social hierarchy within the audience to be distinguishable by dress. After the *lex Roscia theatralis* the audience comprised the senators in the orchestra with their *latus clavus*, the equestrians in the first fourteen rows with their *angustus clavus*, and the *plebs* with their plain white togas in the remainder of the seats. Near the rear of the theatre were the poor who were unable to afford the toga and individuals who were not citizens and therefore not entitled to wear the toga, seated if there were any seats available or standing with the slaves if there were not, attired in their dark woolen tunics and other clothing.

While it is clear that Republican women did attend the theatre, their exact location is an issue of debate.⁴¹ Vitruvius recommends that the site for a theatre – although he is not referring specifically to Rome – be chosen for health reasons for those *cum coniugibus et liberis persedentes*, meaning that families, including presumably those with no children, attended

³⁹ Plut. *Vit. Cic.* 13.

⁴⁰ The tribune of the *plebs* of 25 B.C.E., Gaius Thorianus, brought his father, a freedman, to sit with him in these reserved seats (Dio Cass. 53.27.6).

⁴¹ Among many examples, Cicero (*Tusc.* 1.37) reveals that women did attend the theatre but not where they were seated.

together.⁴² Plautus' *Poenulus* implies that men and women were indeed seated together in the Republican theatre.⁴³ What of the wives of senators and *equites*? It must be questioned whether in a society based upon a strict social hierarchy and the privileges which membership in an upper *ordo* could bestow, women would have been allowed to share their husbands' *prohedria*. Using Lucretius' description of the Republican theatre, L.R. Taylor and C. Schnurr suggest that the wives of senators were seated in the orchestra with their husbands; the passage to which they refer, however, is corrupt and no firm conclusions can be drawn from it.⁴⁴ Schnurr believes that the wives of *equites* would also have been seated with their husbands; since it seems that in general women sat with their husbands in the Republican theatre, she sees no reason why senatorial or equestrian wives would not have done the same.⁴⁵ It is not only the general Roman attitude towards women that makes this unlikely. Wives were not officially included in the

⁴² Vitruvius, *De arch.* 5.3.1; Rawson 1987, 90 n. 39; Schnurr 1992, 148. For Vitruvian theatre design see Sear (1990); Gros (1994b).

⁴³ Plautus, *Poen.* 32-35: *matronae tacitae spectent, tacitae rideant, canora hic voce sua tinnire temperent, domum sermones fabulandi conferant, ne et hic viris sint et domi molestiae*. "Let matrons watch in silence, let them laugh in silence, let them temper their tuneful chirping here, let them take their prattle home, and let them not be a nuisance to their husbands here as well as there." (adapted from the Loeb, P. Nixon, trans.)

⁴⁴ See the OCT of Lucretius, 4.77-80, 4.79 in particular: *†patrum matrumque†*. Taylor (1952, 148-150) argues that the reading of the text which supports her theory is correct while Schnurr (1992, 149-150) follows Taylor yet makes no mention of the difficulties with the text.

⁴⁵ Schnurr 1992, 149-150. She argues that "...it is quite conceivable that Roman women of the Republican period who were members of that eminently proud class, the *ordo senatorius*, should with aristocratic conviction sit beside their husbands in the senatorial seats." She also suggests that the *lex Iulia theatralis* (below) might have separated senators and their wives for the first time. Lilja (1985, 69) believes that seating arrangements would have differed between the temporary theatres such as those of Plautus' time and the only permanent Republican theatre, that of Pompey, rather than between Republican and Augustan times. It is Augustus' *lex Iulia theatralis* that is, in my judgement, the benchmark for seating legislation and the point before and after which a comparison should be made, not the construction of the first permanent theatre. Lilja (70-71) concludes that in permanent theatres unaccompanied women, whom she suggests would have been mostly slave-girls and prostitutes, were seated at the back while matrons as well as other

senatorial order until the late Antonine period (and then only nominally) and the *ordo equester* never officially included wives or children.⁴⁶ If the wives of senators were not considered part of the order until after the time of Augustus, when all women except the Vestal Virgins were forced to sit at the back of the theatre, it is unlikely that during the Republic senatorial wives would have been able to share the seating of their husbands. Since the wives of *equites* were never part of the equestrian order it is equally unlikely for them.⁴⁷ One visible distinction among women may have been that *matronae* wore the *stola* and prostitutes wore the toga.⁴⁸ While in general men and women appear to have been seated together in the Republican theatre, the wives of senators and *equites* were most likely seated separately from their husbands. This mixed viewing was to change under Augustus.

The first permanent stone theatre erected in Rome was that of Pompey in 55 B.C.E.⁴⁹ Stone theatres were common throughout Italy and the lack of such a venue in the capital before that of Pompey is worth noting. There were in fact earlier attempts at building a permanent theatre; Livy mentions one in 179 and another in 174 B.C.E.⁵⁰ In 154 a permanent theatre was

accompanied women were seated with their male escorts, generally their husbands.

⁴⁶ Chastagnol 1979, 23.

⁴⁷ Rawson (1987, 91) puts it best: "...it would be against all precedent and parallel in the long history of *prohedria* for magistrates, priests and *bouleutai* to suppose that their wives shared the privilege."

⁴⁸ Since the toga was a male garment, on prostitutes it symbolized that they had abandoned female decency and were in effect the antithesis of the Roman male; it was also associated with adulteresses (Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.62, .82; Ov. *Ars am.* 2.600; *Pont.* 3.3.51-52; *Fast.* 4.134; Tib. 1.6.67; Mart. 2.39, 6.64.4, 10.52; Juv. 2.68-70); see Gardner 1986, 215-252; Edmondson 1996, 85; Edwards 1997, 81.

⁴⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 3.23, 3.72, 6.45, 13.54, 14.20; Mart. 10.51, 11.21, 14.29, 14.166; Plut. *Vit. Pomp.* 40.5, 42.4, 52.4; Dio Cass. 60.7.1; Suet. *Tib.* 47; *Cal.* 21; *Claud.* 21.1; Aul. Gell. 10.1.7; Prop. 2.11-12; Vell. Pat. 2.48.2.

⁵⁰ Livy 40.51, 41.27.

under construction but Publius Cornelius Nasica convinced the senate that it should be demolished because it was useless and harmful to public morals.⁵¹ A ban was then imposed preventing seating from being built at games held within the *pomerium* but was lifted by 145 at the latest, when Lucius Mummius erected seats at the plays held for his triumph.⁵² Since permanent theatres were not allowed, *ludi scaenici* were held in increasingly elaborate temporary structures culminating in the lavish theatre of Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, built in 58 B.C.E.⁵³

In 55 Pompey built his permanent theatre outside the *pomerium* and was able to forestall any argument on the part of the senate by adding a temple to *Venus Victrix* at the top of the *cavea*, effectively making the seats the stairs to the temple.⁵⁴ The reluctance of the senate to allow the construction of a permanent theatre or even seating can be attributed to a variety of factors. A stone theatre would give the people a place to gather and express their discontent, the content of the plays could be political, theatre was seen by many as ostentatious, luxurious, and damaging to Roman morals,⁵⁵ it was thought to be better for Roman character to stand,⁵⁶ and the whole concept of theatre was coloured by foreign, non-Roman ideas.⁵⁷ The lack of a permanent

⁵¹ Livy *Epit. Per.* 48; Val. Max. 2.4.2.

⁵² Tac. *Ann.* 14.20.

⁵³ Val. Max. 2.4.6; Plin. *NH* 33.53, 36.114-115. Wooden theatres continued to be used even after the construction of the theatre of Pompey, evidence for which can be found on the *phylakes* vases (Beacham 1992, 1-26, 56-85).

⁵⁴ Tert. *De spect.* 10. See Frézouls (1983b) and Martin-Bueno (1992) for the religious context of theatres; Frézouls concentrates on the theatre of Pompey in particular.

⁵⁵ Livy *Epit. Per.* 48. A permanent theatre occupied urban space yet was not used on a continuous basis, which to the Romans was indeed luxury (Coleman 2000, 219).

⁵⁶ Val. Max. 2.4.2.

⁵⁷ For discussion of the role of theatre in politics, and Roman theatre and theatrical structures in general see also Bieber (1939); Frézouls (1983a, 1990); Dupont (1985); Rawson (1985); Beacham (1999); Edwards (1993, 1997); Scodel (1993); Edmondson (1996); Parker (1999); Gros (2002).

theatre also allowed the senators, responsible for the construction of the temporary structures, to impress their position of power upon the people. The sponsors of the temporary theatres were in control of their gift to the *plebs* since they dictated when the theatres were to be built, when they were to be taken down, and even if they were to be built at all.⁵⁸ The view of those in power changed, however, and by the time of Pompey the same reasons that a permanent theatre had been unappealing now made it appealing. It provided a controlled, segregated area in which large groups of people could be brought together under close supervision, and the events taking place on the stage could be manipulated by the individual sponsoring the performance to his own advantage.⁵⁹

The enforcement of seating legislation for both senators and *equites* before – in the case of the senators over a century before – the construction of a permanent theatre asserts the importance of the theatre as a venue for displaying the social hierarchy. It was a structure which collected large groups of people together in one place and allowed them both to see one another and to be seen easily. Although the temporary theatres were being constructed and demolished, the seating hierarchy of the theatre remained the same; while the venue changed, the audience arrangements remained a constant and effective visual reinforcement of the social organization of the state.

⁵⁸ Gruen 1992, 208-209. Holleran (2003, 58) suggests that the lack of a permanent theatre in Rome can also be attributed to the desire of prominent Romans for recognition. The state would not erect a permanent building for leisure and an individual politician would not have wanted to fund such an enterprise anonymously; until Pompey no one dared to build a stone theatre under his own auspices in Rome.

⁵⁹ Beacham (1992, 158-159); Gruen (1992, 221-222).

During the Republic *munera* were generally held in the Forum Romanum but could also on occasion take place in the Forum Boarium and the Circus Maximus.⁶⁰ In 52 B.C.E. Gaius Curio built a wooden structure consisting of two theatres back-to-back which were then turned to face each other in the afternoon for gladiatorial shows, essentially the first amphitheatre in Rome.⁶¹ Even after the construction of the first stone amphitheatre by Statilius Taurus in 29 B.C.E. *munera* were held predominantly in the Forum, the *Saepta Iulia*, or in temporary wooden structures until the construction of the Flavian amphitheatre.⁶² The Forum may have been used on a regular basis until its destruction in the fires of 14 and 9 B.C.E.; its continued use reflects its important political and cultural associations throughout the Republic.⁶³

Seating at Republican *munera* was not as strictly regulated as it was in the theatre, but it may have been common practice to reserve the best areas in the temporary wooden stands for magistrates and members of their families as well as having a block of seats for senators.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Forum Romanum: Cic. *Phil.* 9.7.16; Plut. *Vit. C. Gracch.* 12.3-4; Pseudo-Asconius *Div. in Caec.* 16-50; Livy 23.31.15; Plin. *NH* 19.23; Dio Cass. 53.22; see also Carettoni (1956-1958); Golvin (1988, 56-58); Welch (1994, 69-78). Forum Boarium: Val. Max. 2.4.7; Livy *Epit. Per.* 16. Circus Maximus: Suet. *Iul.* 39.2; Plin. *NH* 8.21. For the history, development, and role of *munera* see for example Dodge (1999) and Futrell (2000) with bibliography.

⁶¹ Plin. *HN* 36.116-120. According to Pliny after the first few days some of the spectators became so used to the structure that they remained in their seats when the theatres rotated. See Etienne (1965a) for discussion of the development of the term *amphitheatrum*.

⁶² Dio Cass. 51.23.1; Suet. *Aug.* 29. Augustus, Tiberius, and Caligula may have used the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus (Suet. *Aug.* 43.1; *Tib.* 7.1; *Cal.* 18.4); Augustus and Caligula also used, as did Claudius, the *Saepta* (Suet. *Aug.* 43.1; *Cal.* 18.1; *Claud.* 21.4; Dio Cass. 55.10.7). For the study of Roman amphitheatres see for example Golvin (1988); Bomgardner (1991, 1993, 2000); Futrell (2000).

⁶³ Golvin (1988, 19-21, 45-47, 56-58); Bomgardner (1993, 376); Beacham (1999, 37-38); Dodge (1999, 225). Welch (1991, 276) suggests that the only reason the Romans stopped using the Forum Romanum was that it was no longer large enough to hold the increasing number of people attending *munera*; see Welch (1994) for the development of the amphitheatre in the Republic.

⁶⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 9.7.16, 9.16.

Occasionally in the Circus individuals and their families were also given reserved seats for service to the state.⁶⁵ Senators had their own reserved area at *munera* by 39/38 B.C.E. at the latest; on this date a *senatus consultum* was passed allowing ambassadors of the Parasians and Aphrodisians to sit in the area reserved for senators at games, gladiatorial shows, *venationes*, and athletic competitions in Rome or within one mile of the city.⁶⁶ Senators traditionally controlled access to the games by giving tickets or seats to members of their tribe and to their clients.⁶⁷ It seems that Romans of a lower social status who did not have the social connections necessary to receive these tickets would only have been able to attend *munera* by paying for the privilege, and they would have watched the spectacle from ground level, standing behind barricades outside the arena.⁶⁸ Plutarch relates that Gaius Gracchus requested that the stands for a *munus* be dismantled; after his request was ignored he had the seats torn down the night before so that the

⁶⁵ See Livy 2.31 for the grant of a *sella curulis* in the Circus Maximus to the family of Marcus Valerius Maximus and see Val. Max. 4.4.8 for the grant of a *locus spectandi* to the *gens Aelia* in the Circus Maximus and Circus Flaminius; Edmondson (2002, 44). Ovid discusses the Circus under Augustus as an ideal place to meet women, and the same surely would have applied during the Republic (Ov., *Ars am.* 1.135-176; *Am.* 3.2; *Tr.* 2.279-284); see Balsdon (1969, 258); Edmondson (1996, 87). There were two Republican Circuses in Rome: the Circus Flaminius built in the Campus Martius in 221 and the Circus Maximus located between the Palatine and Aventine hills, established by 329 (Plin. *HN* 36.24.102; Livy 1.35.8, 1.56.2; Dion. Hal. *Rom. Ant.* 3.68; *De Vir. Ill.* 8.3; see Balsdon 1969, 252-253). Livy's (1.35.8) statement that the senators and *equites* had reserved seats is anachronistic since they were not granted these seats until much later, but Ville (1981, 434-435) suggests that it was a privilege which fell into disuse until reinstated by Augustus (below). For more on the Circus see Cameron (1976) and Humphrey (1986).

⁶⁶ Reynolds 1982, doc. 8.76-78, doc. 9.10-11.

⁶⁷ Cic. *Att.* 2.1; *Mur.* 73. Cicero, for example, did not give gladiatorial tickets to the Sicilians when he was quaestor there, but when Clodius became their patron he intended to start the practice. This could also happen in the Circus (Cic. *Mur.* 73). If not sponsoring the games, senators would have received groups of tickets from officials and magistrates to give away (Balsdon 1969, 258; Futrell 2000, 162-163).

⁶⁸ Cic. *Sest.* 58.124; Ville 1981, 432; Edmondson 1996, 87; Futrell 2000, 163. For *munera* produced for profit see Chamberland (2007).

plebs could watch for free.⁶⁹ It was not until 63 B.C.E. that legislation was passed preventing the sponsor of the games from handing out tickets to his friends and clients, although others would still have been able to exercise this patronage on his behalf.⁷⁰

As in the theatre, most women and men were seated together at Republican *munera* (Sulla, for example, met his wife at a gladiatorial presentation).⁷¹ Vestal Virgins, however, had their own seats at *munera*; privileged seating for this group in the theatre was later enforced by the *lex Iulia theatralis* of Augustus.⁷² The process of patronage and the reservation of seats for senators as well as magistrates and their families reveal that the hierarchy of Roman society, effectively displayed in the theatre, was also beginning to affect seating at gladiatorial shows.

The Augustan Era

Although seating in the Republican theatre reflected the importance of the *ordo senatorius* and *ordo equester* to Roman society, it was not until Augustus that full advantage was taken of the use of an audience as a tool to present a detailed, static, public display of an idealized social hierarchy. Augustus organized Roman spectators in accordance with his social programme and this display was presented in full view not only of audience members from the local population of the city but also of visitors. This process of structuring an audience according

⁶⁹ Plut. *Vit. C. Gracch.* 12.3-4.

⁷⁰ Cic. *Mur.* 67, 72, 73; Balsdon 1969, 258.

⁷¹ Plut. *Vit. Sull.* 35.3; Cic. *Att.* 2.1. Ville (1981, 432-433) suggests that the lack of *prohedria* for senators and *equites* was because of the private nature of *munera* at this time.

⁷² Cic. *Mur.* 73. The location of their seats is unknown, but since the Vestal Virgin was lending hers to Murena as a gift it can be assumed that it was in a favourable location.

to the social and political views of those in charge is found throughout Italy and the provinces and is discussed in the chapters that follow.

Pliny refers to a *lex Iulia theatralis* in regard to a tightening up of the *ordo equester* in 23 C.E.⁷³ This law was passed by Augustus in order to regulate seating in the theatre and (although to what extent is unclear) at *munera* as well in his overall attempt to strictly define the hierarchical system of Roman society, to compensate for the triumviral period when many rules of the *discrimina ordinum* had been broken.⁷⁴ By legislating seating at *munera*, even to a minimal extent, Augustus was able to strictly limit the Republican practice of patronage since the best seats were now only open to the members of the upper orders themselves.⁷⁵ Suetonius provides the most detailed description available of the new arrangement, worth quoting here in full:

⁷³ Plin. *HN* 33.32. As Edmondson (1996, 75) points out, modern knowledge of *munera* and of festivals during the Republic and Imperial period is limited, and of the known *munera* during the empire the vast majority were put on under the auspices of the emperor. This limits any detailed discussion of the effectiveness of spectacles in reinforcing the *discrimina ordinum* in the principate only to those put on in Rome by the ruler, but important information concerning the social and civic structure in the provinces, as well as the motivation behind the organization of spectators, can be gathered for spectacles outside Rome (Chapters 2, 3, and 4).

⁷⁴ The phrase *discrimina ordinum* is used by Tacitus (*Ann.* 13.54) to describe the audience in the theatre of Pompey under Nero. Suetonius (*Aug.* 44.1) makes no distinction between the theatre and amphitheatre in regard to the *lex Iulia theatralis* and it is unclear whether all of the elements of the *lex Iulia theatralis* were meant to apply to gladiatorial shows or only some of them; the only direct reference to *munera* by Suetonius concerns the seating of women. Beacham (1999, 123) argues that the lack of distinction in the *lex* between theatrical and amphitheatrical events is circumstantial evidence that *munera* did not take place only in the Forum, Circus, or new permanent amphitheatre, but also may have taken place in the permanent stone theatres (Augustus also held them in the *Saepta Iulia* (Dio Cass. 55.10.7) and the Campus Martius (Suet. *Aug.* 43.1)). He suggests that since the *lex* confined women to the back of the theatre at gladiatorial events, it was the presence of *munera* in the theatre that necessitated the shift in the seating of women, not the events on stage.

⁷⁵ Futrell 2000, 164.

*Spectandi confusissimum ac solutissimum morem correxit ordinavitque, motus iniuria senatoris, quem Puteolis per celeberrimos ludos consessu frequenti nemo receperat. Facto igitur decreto patrum ut, quotiens quid spectaculi usquam publice ederetur, primus subselliorum ordo vacaret senatoribus, Romae legatos liberarum sociarumque gentium vetuit in orchestre sedere, cum quosdam etiam libertini generis mitti deprendisset. Militem secrevit a populo. Maritis e plebe proprios ordines assignavit, praetextatis cuneum suum, et proximum paedagogis, sanxitque ne quis pullatorum media cavea sederet. Feminis ne gladiatores quidem, quos promiscue spectari sollemne olim erat, nisi ex superiore loco spectare concessit. Solis virginibus Vestalibus locum in theatro separatim et contra praetoris tribunal dedit.*⁷⁶

The *lex* most likely dates to sometime between 22 and 17 B.C.E. since in 22 Augustus regulated various issues concerning the games, including who was allowed to perform in the arena as well as who was to preside over them, when they were allowed to do so, and how much they could spend.⁷⁷

The *lex Iulia theatralis* assigned all levels of the population seats according to their social standing and their political involvement and responsibility and was meant to be applied, in

⁷⁶ Suet. *Div. Aug.* 44. "He corrected and arranged the disorderly and indiscriminate fashion of viewing spectacles, motivated by the insult to a senator to whom no one had offered a seat in a crowded house at some busy games in Puteoli. As a result of this the senate decreed that, whenever any public show was given anywhere, the first row of seats should be reserved for senators; at Rome Augustus forbade the envoys of the free and allied nations to sit in the orchestra, since he was informed that even freedmen were sometimes appointed. He separated the soldiers from the people. He assigned special seats to the married men of the *plebs*, gave to boys under age their own section and to their paedagogues the adjoining section, and he decreed that no one wearing a dark cloak should sit in the middle of the auditorium. He would not allow women to view even the gladiators except from the upper seats, although it had been the custom for men and women to sit together at such shows. Only the Vestal Virgins were assigned a place to themselves, opposite the praetor's tribunal." Adapted from the *Loeb*, J.C. Rolfe, trans.

⁷⁷ Edmondson (1996, 88) dates the *lex Iulia theatralis* to somewhere between 20 and 17 B.C.E. and the initial decree of the senate to leave the front rows of all spectacles open for senators to 26 B.C.E. (2002, 45); Gros (1994a, 291) provides a date of 23; Rawson (1987, 98-99) suggests a date between 22 and 19. In 22 Augustus transferred responsibility for state festivals from the aediles to the praetors and also forbade any praetor to contribute more than his colleagues to the festivals, to hold gladiatorial combat except by a decree of the senate, and to have more than one hundred and twenty contestants (Dio Cass. 54.2.3-4).

some form or another, throughout the empire.⁷⁸ It was an idealized construction of society, one created according to Augustus' desires, that was on display. It seems that Augustus allowed slaves, previously forced to stand behind the last row of seats, to sit in the *summa cavea* with the free poor who sat at the back as they had during the Republic.⁷⁹ In contrast to the mixed viewing of the Republic, women were moved to the back of the theatre to be seated with the slaves and the free poor.⁸⁰ *Matronae* and their daughters would most likely have been seated separately, a distinction for which there was Greek precedent, and unmarried women over a certain age may not have been present at all.⁸¹

Ovid and Propertius support Suetonius' description of the *lex* since as *equites* they were seated in the first fourteen rows and relate that they had to turn their heads to look for women at the back of the theatre.⁸² The passage from Ovid is controversial. He is complaining to his

⁷⁸ To what extent the Augustan seating legislation was implemented in the provinces will be addressed in Chapters 2 and 3. The following discussion of the seating arrangements of the *lex Iulia theatralis* moves from the back of the theatre to the front, using as its model Rawson's seminal article (1987).

⁷⁹ See for example Horace (*Epist.* 2.1.182-188) concerning those seated nearer the back of the theatre; Rawson (1987, 87, 89); Futrell (2000, 165). In the prologue to Plautus' *Poenulus* slaves are told to stand; several of his plays provide Republican evidence that the poor were seated or standing at the back of the theatre (above).

⁸⁰ Balsdon (1969, 258) suggests that the segregation of women at *munera* was an indication that the games had lost their private character, and would from then on be given in Rome only under the authority of the state.

⁸¹ In 12 B.C.E. ἀγύνοι and ἀνάνδροι were allowed to attend banquets and watch public shows on Augustus' birthday, implying that they could not do so at other times (Dio Cass. 54.30). While certain aspects of the seating arrangements dictated by the *lex Iulia theatralis* may have come directly from Greece (Schnurr 1992, 151-154), they may also have arrived in Rome via Campania before the end of the Republic (Rawson 1987, 90). See Chapter 3 for the organization of audiences in classical Athens.

⁸² Prop. 4.8.77; Ov. *Am.* 2.7.3-4; also Golvin (1988, 348); Rawson (1987, 89-91); Schnurr (1992, 150). Ovid still recommends the theatre, although not its seating areas, as a place to meet women (*Ars am.* 1.89-134, 1.494-504; *Rem. am.* 751-756).

mistress that when they are at the theatre and he happens to glance up to the back of the audience, she thinks he is searching for another woman. S. Lilja has taken this to mean that Ovid's mistress must be seated beside him or else she would not know where he was looking or if he were looking at another woman.⁸³ This can, however, be explained in other ways: his mistress, seated in the back of the theatre, was able to see the general direction in which Ovid was looking and recognized that it was not at her, perhaps a friend told her what had happened, or he may have in fact been looking at his mistress but she assumed he was looking at someone else.⁸⁴ If the wives of senators and *equites* were allowed to be seated with their husbands under Augustus, which it appears they were not allowed to do in the Republic, Suetonius would surely not have made a point of stating that women were separated from men even at gladiatorial games and only the Vestal Virgins were allowed near the arena or the stage.⁸⁵ Since the woman to whom Ovid is speaking is his mistress and a freedwoman, it is even more difficult to imagine that she had managed to sit next to the poet in the equestrian fourteen rows.

Augustus may have moved women to the back of the audience to ensure their safety in the rowdy crowds of the theatre and amphitheatre and to distance them from the potentially sexual or violent events taking place on stage or in the arena. He may have been making an effort to decrease flirtation at the spectacles to serve as an indication of the moral superiority of the Roman people; women were denied suffrage and had little official political involvement and

⁸³ Lilja 1985, 67-71.

⁸⁴ Rawson 1987, 91.

⁸⁵ Beltrán and Pina (2003, 44) suggest without providing evidence that it is possible that the wives

responsibility, also affecting their seating. Augustus may even have been attempting to discourage women from attending spectacles at all by forcing them to climb to the top of the venue to get to their seats.⁸⁶ It is in fact difficult to imagine the wife of a senator or equestrian making her way to the very back of the audience, near the slaves and the poor.

The Vestal Virgins were the only women not moved by Augustus to the rear of the venue, and they in fact had excellent seats in one of the *tribunalia*.⁸⁷ Augustus' decision to grant the Vestal Virgins, alone out of all the women in the audience, seats in such proximity to the events taking place on stage or in the arena at first glance seems to be incongruous. Even female members of the imperial family were not allowed to sit with the Vestal Virgins until the time of Tiberius, when he granted the honour to Livia.⁸⁸ Augustus' motivation can be attributed to the unique position the Vestal Virgins occupied in Roman society in terms of their sexuality. M. Beard argues that far from being merely virginal maidens, these priestesses combined within themselves not only elements of both married and unmarried women but also certain characteristics that cannot be seen as anything other than male. The Vestal Virgins had privileges

of senators and *equites* were able to sit with their husbands under Augustus.

⁸⁶ Lilja 1985, 69; Schnurr 1992, 153-154; Bomgardner 2000, 16-17 (cf. Hopkins and Beard 2005, 107); Futrell 2000, 165; Edmondson 2002, 48. Bomgardner (2000, 12, 14) suggests that Augustus' motivation may also have been based upon the protection the *velum* or colonnade at the top of the *cavea* would offer women from the sun and rain.

⁸⁷ Futrell (2000, 162) believes that this location for their seating makes sense in an amphitheatrical context, where the tribunals were situated at either end of the short axis, but not in theatres where the tribunal was located centrally in the *cavea*, directly opposite the stage. This was indeed the case in Greek theatres in the eastern empire (Chapter 3) where the *parodoi* were uncovered, but in Roman theatres the *tribunalia* were located above each *aditus maximus*, entrance into the orchestral area, although there could be a central area of honour in the *cavea*.

⁸⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 4.16; *infra* n. 138.

that were usually only granted to men: they had the use of a lictor, were allowed to give evidence in court as if they were male, and were unlike other women in terms of testamentary powers in that they could bequeath property in their own right.⁸⁹ It is because of this combination of sexualities and genders that the Vestal Virgins were not made to sit with other women. The potential role of these priestesses as visible representatives of the male members of their families, with whom they were often publicly associated, may have been another factor behind their seating.⁹⁰ The male element to their gender and their important position within the state made privileged seating, near the events of the stage or arena as well as at eye-level to the sponsor of the games seated in the *tribunal* opposite, acceptable.⁹¹

Augustus assigned a *cuneus* to *praetextati* and a separate one to their *paedagogi*. This may be based upon the Athenian precedent of reserving an area for the ephebes in the theatre, but Augustus was also concerned about Roman children and the birth-rate as well as the control of rowdy youngsters at the spectacles, a responsibility which fell to the boys' *paedagogi* in the next *cuneus*.⁹² The social status of the *paedagogi*, who were freedmen or slaves, ensured that they and their charges were seated nearer to the back of the venue than the front but their role as

⁸⁹ Beard 1980, 15-18; also Hopkins (1983, 18).

⁹⁰ Hallett 1989, 68; see also Chapters 2, 3, and 4.

⁹¹ Kolendo (1981, 302) asserts that the factors that determined which seats were the best were distance from the arena or stage, a central or lateral location, and the distance from the individual presiding over the games. It was in a *tribunal* that Augustus was seated when his *sella curulis* collapsed (Suet. *Aug.* 43.5), and in which Claudius was seated when he presided over the rededication of the Theatre of Pompey (Suet. *Claud.* 21.2; Dio Cass. 60.68).

⁹² Rawson 1987, 91; Beacham 1999, 123. For ephebes in the Athenian theatre and in eastern venues under the Romans see Chapter 3.

educators of young Roman citizens allowed them to sit among the freeborn.⁹³ Young boys with no toga or *paedagogus* presumably would have been seated at the back of the *cavea* with the rest of the free poor; only a single *cuneus* was assigned to the *praetextati*, within which any boy whose family could afford to buy him a toga could sit.⁹⁴

Augustus' relegation of different social levels of foreigners to different seats clearly reflects his concern with the Roman hierarchy. He barred public *hospites* from sitting in the orchestra or with the senators at games because freedmen could be envoys. They may have been seated just behind the *equites* in the *ima cavea*, acknowledging their political role as envoys, or in the *media cavea* with the *togati*.⁹⁵ There would have been no reason why foreign visitors of noble birth would not still be seated with the senators, while unofficial *peregrini* might have had an area of their own at the edge of the venue, based perhaps on Athenian as well as Roman tradition, or may have been seated behind the *togati*.⁹⁶ The *plebs togata* would have occupied the majority of the seats in the *media cavea*; they may have been divided into tribes, or perhaps into the *plebs frumentaria* and those who did not receive the grain dole.⁹⁷

⁹³ Orlandi 2004, 176.

⁹⁴ Rawson 1987, 91; Beacham 1999, 124. Futrell (2000, 162) argues that at the games boys would have had their own *cuneus* within the *maenianum* assigned to their social group. She seems to be implying that the sons of senators, of *equites*, and of members of the *plebs togata* who were old enough to have a *paedagogus* and whose family could afford one would all have their own *cuneus* near their fathers. This does not yet seem to have been the case, although later senatorial seats did include sons; see below.

⁹⁵ Rawson (1987, 92) believes that Augustus moved the public *hospites* behind the *equites*.

⁹⁶ Rawson (1987, 92-94) suggests that Suetonius did not mention seating for *peregrini* because he took it for granted. There is Roman precedent for an area reserved for *peregrini*: the late Republican *lex Ursonensis* from Spain provides for the seating of *adventores* (see Chapter 2). For possible Athenian precedent see Chapter 3.

⁹⁷ Beacham 1999, 124. Rawson (1987, 94-98) points out that tribal divisions may have been awkward since, for example, the urban tribes would have needed more space than the rural tribes.

Augustus assigned *mariti* reserved seats among the *plebs togata* and it is possible that bachelors were not always allowed to be present. For the Secular Games in 17 B.C.E. the *senatus consultum de ludis saecularibus* exempted those who were not married from the ban on their presence, and in 12 B.C.E. ἀγύνοι and ἀνάνδρτοι were granted the right to watch public shows and to attend banquets on Augustus' birthday.⁹⁸ Both these events imply that unmarried men were not normally allowed at spectacles.⁹⁹ It is unclear exactly to whom this ban applies but because of Augustus' concern with the birth and marriage rate among the upper *ordines* in particular it may have affected only senators and *equites*.¹⁰⁰ The ban presumably would have been revoked by the *lex Papia Poppaea* in 9 C.E. at the latest because of the resentment of those to whom it applied, but may have been in force when the *lex Iulia theatralis* was originally passed.¹⁰¹ The *lex Papia Poppaea* granted privileges, including prominent seats in the theatre, to individuals with the *ius trium liberorum*, those men who had three or more children.¹⁰² If the ban on *caelibes* did indeed only apply to senators and equestrians Augustus would have had to distinguish in some fashion between married and unmarried members of the *plebs togata* in order to assign the *mariti* their separate seats, perhaps in front of those for the bachelors. Separate seating would have visibly emphasized Augustus' concern for marriage and the birthrate.¹⁰³

⁹⁸ *FIRA* I 40.1; Dio Cass. 54.30. For more on Roman marriage, see Treggiari (1991).

⁹⁹ Rawson (1987, 98) discusses as a possible precedent the total ban on unmarried men in Sparta, where they were banned from the *Gymnopaedia* in the *theatron*.

¹⁰⁰ It was the *equites* who protested against this ban most vociferously (Suet. *Div. Aug.* 34.1).

¹⁰¹ Rawson 1987, 98; Schnurr 1992, 159-160; Beacham 1999, 124.

¹⁰² Mart. 2.91.6, 2.92, 3.95.5-10, 9.66. See below for the *lex Papia Poppaea* and the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus*.

¹⁰³ Rawson 1987, 98; Beacham 1999, 124. *Mariti* still had their own seats in the time of Martial

When Augustus separated the soldiers from the people he was providing reserved seating for off-duty soldiers and veterans.¹⁰⁴ S. Bingham argues that he was establishing command posts of a sort for soldiers, praetorians, who were present to maintain order.¹⁰⁵ There were indeed guards at spectacles but in the context of the *lex Iulia theatralis* it is much more likely that Suetonius was referring to Augustus' provision of reserved seats for soldiers rather than areas for on-duty praetorians.¹⁰⁶ In front of the *plebs togata* and the military he placed the *decuriae* of *apparitores* (the *scribae*, *lictores*, *viatores*, and *praecones*).¹⁰⁷ By seating them near the front of the audience Augustus was visibly emphasizing the importance of these officials and attendants, thereby reinforcing his role as head of the social hierarchy.¹⁰⁸

The following rows, the first fourteen of the theatre, were reserved for the *ordo equester*.¹⁰⁹ In the amphitheatre the first fourteen rows would have provided far more seating

(Mart. 5.41.8).

¹⁰⁴ Rawson 1987, 99. Under Tiberius the senator Junius Gallo suggested that the praetorians who had finished their years of service should be allowed to sit in the equestrian rows but the emperor refused (Tac. *Ann.* 6.3).

¹⁰⁵ Bingham (1999, 370-371) suggests that the guards, whom she believes were an extension of Augustus' praetorian bodyguard, were meant to keep an eye on the spectators and that having them separate from the audience in specific locations, rather than interspersed among the crowd, would have made this task easier.

¹⁰⁶ For guards at the theatre, see for example Tac. *Ann.* 1.77, 13.24, 16.5.

¹⁰⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 16.12; Rawson 1987, 99-100; Edmondson 1996, 92. For more on the *apparitores*, see Jones (1949, 38-43); Purcell (1983). The *scribae* in particular seem to have been held in high esteem, at least during the Republic, and some were even given the gold ring of the equestrian order (Cic. *Verr.* 3.185).

¹⁰⁸ Beacham 1999, 124.

¹⁰⁹ It is in the description of the *lex Iulia theatralis* by Pliny (*HN* 33.32) that the census qualification for the *ordo equester* is mentioned as being 400,000 sesterces. Pliny discusses the law passed under Tiberius in 23 C.E. outlining who was able to wear the gold ring of the *equites* in an effort to restrict admission into the order: *ne cui ius esset nisi qui ingenuus ipse, patre, avo paterno HS CCCC census fuisset et lege Iulia theatri in quattuordecim ordinibus sedisset* ("only he [was able to wear the gold ring] who was himself an *ingenuus*, whose father and paternal grandfather had qualified as an equestrian through the 400,000 sesterces census requirement, and who had been allowed to sit in the equestrian fourteen rows as

space than in the theatre; whether or not the equestrians had the same area assigned to them in the amphitheatre is unclear.¹¹⁰ The division of the equestrian seating into age groups (Tacitus mentions that the *cuneus iuniorum* was named the *cuneus Germanici* after the death of the prince) was most likely an Augustan innovation as opposed to a stipulation of the *lex Roscia theatralis*.¹¹¹ The first two rows of the equestrian seats were assigned to *tribuni militum* and *ex-tribuni militum*; some other minor magistracies were also seated here.¹¹²

The wearers of the *corona civica* were seated either in front of the *equites* and behind the senators or in the last row of the senatorial seating.¹¹³ The senators were seated on *subsellia* in the orchestra of the theatre and on the podium, in the row or rows closest to the arena, in the amphitheatre.¹¹⁴ The most important individuals in the senatorial rows may have been seated on *sellae curules*.¹¹⁵ Although the legislation of 194 B.C.E. granted senators reserved seats it was not always put into practice, and it was the inability of a senator in Puteoli to find a seat that

was decreed by the *lex Iulia theatralis*”). The issue of the definition of an *eques Romanus* again comes into play with Augustus’ legislation; see Rawson (1987, 102-107) for a detailed discussion of both sides of the argument.

¹¹⁰ Futrell (2000, 162) suggests that the first fourteen rows of the amphitheatre would have constituted the first *maenianum*, but this cannot be applied to all amphitheatres in Rome; Edmondson (1996, 91 n.97) argues that there is no concrete evidence that the rows assigned to the *equites* in the amphitheatre were in fact the first fourteen. See below for a discussion of the seats for *equites* in the Flavian amphitheatre.

¹¹¹ Tac. *Ann.* 2.83; Rawson 1987, 105.

¹¹² Pseudo-Acro and Porph. on Horace *Epod.* 4.15-16. Ovid (*Fast.* 4.377-386) sits next to a man who tells him that he received his seat through military service, while Ovid received his in a time of peace; an ex-tribune and an ex-decemvir are seated together. It is possible that the first two of the fourteen equestrian rows were assigned to those serving in office while those who had retired had space behind them (Rawson 1987, 104). Tiberius later refused a request to allow retired praetorians to sit in the fourteen rows (Tac. *Ann.* 6.3).

¹¹³ Plin. *HN* 16.13; Livy 10.47. They were applauded whenever they attended.

¹¹⁴ Theatres outside of the capital, such as those at Arles, Mérida, and Segobriga have broad, shallow steps in the orchestra, usually occupying three rows, for the *subsellia* (Chapter 2).

prompted Augustus to pass seating legislation concerning senators. He had a *senatus consultum* passed which, at its heart, was meant to reinforce the elevated status of the *ordo senatorius* by providing them with reserved seats. It ensured that wherever in the empire a spectacle was held senators would always have the seats closest to the stage or the arena.¹¹⁶ Also in an attempt to secure the senators' elevated status, the *lex Iulia theatralis* removed envoys from the orchestra because they could be freedmen. When Augustus was not presiding over the events on stage or in the arena, he may have been seated among the senators.¹¹⁷ When presiding, Augustus would have been seated on a *sella curulis* in the *tribunal* opposite that of the Vestal Virgins along with the male members of his family and anyone else he wished.¹¹⁸ His privileged position and seating was clear to all present; when he commented upon an *eques* drinking in his seat the man replied that Augustus did not need to worry about losing his place if he got up.¹¹⁹

Distinctions of dress at *munera* and in the theatre under Augustus were very similar to those under the Republic, with the addition of the triumphal dress which he may have worn (a purple toga with gold motifs over a tunic decorated with palms) and the added requirement that *matronae* wear the *stola*.¹²⁰ As they may have done during the Republic, prostitutes presumably

¹¹⁵ Beacham 1999, 125; see Schäfer (1989) for the *sella curulis*.

¹¹⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 44.1.

¹¹⁷ At *munera* this meant on the podium, and Augustus once seated Parthian hostages in the second row at gladiatorial performances, directly behind his own seat (Suet. *Aug.* 43.4; Edmondson 2002, 53). Commodus seems to have sat, at least on some occasions, in the orchestra among the senators (*SHA Commodus* 3.6).

¹¹⁸ Suet. *Aug.* 43.4-5.

¹¹⁹ Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.63.

¹²⁰ Rawson 1987, 90; Edmondson 1996, 85. Rawson suggests that Augustus would have been unsuccessful in making *matronae* wear the *stola* at all times and that it was hardly ever worn after his rule.

wore the toga, distinguishing them from the *matronae*.¹²¹

As mentioned above, it is difficult to know to what extent the *lex Iulia theatralis* was meant to be implemented in the amphitheatre, and it is even more difficult to know to what extent it was actually implemented. The theatre audience had been divided hierarchically during the Republic to a greater extent than that of the amphitheatre, and it may have been easier for spectators in the theatre to adapt to an extension of this hierarchy than it was for those in the amphitheatre to adapt to its new imposition. Although Suetonius states that Augustus confined women to the back rows even at gladiatorial shows, Ovid's recommendation of chariot races and gladiatorial presentations as places to meet women reveals that they would have been seated together at *munera* as in the Circus.¹²² In respect to the seating of women, then, the *lex Iulia theatralis* does not initially appear to have been successfully implemented at *munera*. There is no evidence that the *lex* was meant to apply to the Circus and women and men there were seated together.¹²³ By 5 C.E. Augustus had assigned special seats in the Circus to senators and *equites*; presumably from this time on, as in the Republican theatre, the wives of members of the upper two *ordines* would not have been allowed to sit with their husbands.¹²⁴ Statements of Ovid reveal that there were lines inscribed on the stone seats of the Circus to demarcate seat separation;

Augustus was particularly insistent that male citizens wear the toga in public life (Suet., *Aug.* 40.5); he may have felt the same about the *stola*.

¹²¹ *Supra* n. 48.

¹²² Suet. *Aug.* 44; Ov. *Ars am.* 1.135-176; *Am.* 3.2; *Tr.* 2.279-284; see Edmondson (1996, 88-89).

¹²³ Ov. *Ars am.* 1.135-176; *Am.* 3.2; *Tr.* 2.279-284.

¹²⁴ Dio Cass. 55.22.4. Humphrey (1986, 77) concludes that seating in the circus from the time of Augustus on was "generally but not uniformly by rank," and suggests that citizens were seated according to their tribes (see above for the difficulty of tribal seating). Schnurr (1992, 156) believes that the circus was

this was also the case in the permanent theatres and amphitheatres.¹²⁵ These lines would have made the task of assigning a certain number of seats to an individual or group of individuals much easier.¹²⁶ Augustus himself viewed the events in the Circus with his family from the houses of friends or freedmen although he also constructed an imperial box in the Circus itself.¹²⁷

Roman spectacle played an important role in defining and reinforcing the social order from the Republic to a few years after the death of Augustus. The time period was one in which various social groups, including Augustus and his family, tried to define their places within the hierarchy which was developing following the collapse of the Republic.¹²⁸ Augustus' legislation concerning the theatre and *munera* needs to be placed in the context of his other social legislation. By fixing the senatorial census at one million sesterces he created a financial distinction that reinforced the elevated status of the *ordo senatorius*, but in 22 B.C.E., when he regulated when and by whom *munera* were allowed to be held and how much each *editor* could spend on the spectacle, he subordinated the *ordo*. In combination with these measures Augustus' arrangement of seating helped him to shape a new relationship between himself and the senate, and also to reinforce the traditional relationship between the senators and the *plebs*; he was therefore able to solidify the position of the *ordo senatorius* within the social hierarchy.¹²⁹

spared from Augustan reforms because of its apolitical atmosphere.

¹²⁵ Ov. *Am.* 3.2.19-20; *Ars am.* 141-142; Lilja (1985, 71-73). For such divisions in the provinces see Chapters 2 and 3.

¹²⁶ Although *infra* n. 157 concerning the allocation of amounts of space, not numbers of seats, to the Arval Brothers in the Flavian amphitheatre.

¹²⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 45.1; *RG* 19.

¹²⁸ Edmondson 1996, 75.

¹²⁹ Edmondson 1996, 81. For Augustus' legislation of 22, *supra* n. 76.

He did the same for the *ordo equester* by assigning some of its members to high-ranking administrative positions; his (albeit unsuccessful) attempts to prevent equestrians from performing and his enforcement of the *lex Iulia theatralis* were other ways in which he advertised the social standing of the order.¹³⁰ The *lex Valeria Cornelia* of 5 C.E. created ten centuries of Gaius and Lucius Caesar to act in the elections of praetors and consuls; these centuries were filled by senators and *equites* of high standing, which confirmed the status of the two upper *ordines*.¹³¹ This elevated social status was clearly demonstrated in the theatre through their seating, which in fact led to the upper *ordines*, especially the senators, being over-represented in the audience relative to their actual percentage in the population of Rome.¹³² Augustus' own seating in the theatre (when he was presiding he sat in one of the *tribunalia*) reinforced that he was the new head of state; he was in full view of the audience and although he too was a spectator, he was also himself on stage.¹³³ Although he increased the social standing of the two upper *ordines*, by seating himself in such a prominent position after his reorganization of the theatre audience Augustus clarified that the place of the senators and equestrians within the new social hierarchy was still beneath his own. His seating among the senators when he was not presiding, on the other hand, appears to have been an attempt to convey that while he was the head of state he was still their equal. This illusion was no longer maintained by later emperors who at *munera* began

¹³⁰ See the Conclusion for the prohibition against senatorial and equestrian performances.

¹³¹ The *lex* is known only from the *Tabula Hebana* of 19 C.E.; see Brunt (1961) for detailed discussion.

¹³² Gunderson 1996, 125. By the same token, the *plebs* were under-represented.

¹³³ Lim 1999, 351.

to sit in an enclosure, the *pulvinar*, which visibly separated them from the senators.¹³⁴ Augustus also made himself appear more available to members of the *plebs* since they could, for the most part, see him and interact with him.

Augustus' concern with the decay of the institution of marriage (one of the symptoms of which he considered intermarriage between different social levels) and with the low birthrate motivated him to pass legislation to strictly regulate Roman marriage and reward those who produced children.¹³⁵ The *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* of 18 B.C.E. and the *lex Papia Poppaea* of 9 C.E. forbade marriage between socially unequal individuals, rewarded marriage and the bearing of children, and punished failure to marry and childlessness.¹³⁶ Senators and their male descendants through the male line to their great-grandson were forbidden to marry a freedwoman, an actress, or the daughter of an actor or actress; the same restrictions applied to the female descendants of senators through the male line.¹³⁷ Certain aspects of spectacle legislation allowed Augustus to advertise his marriage and childbearing reforms: *mariti* were assigned special seats by the *lex Iulia theatralis*, *caelibes* were for a certain period of time banned from attending spectacles, and those who had fathered three children were granted prominent seats at

¹³⁴ Edmondson 2002, 53. Nero is said to have watched gladiatorial presentations from within an area of the podium enclosed by curtains for privacy (Suet. *Nero* 12.2); Domitian did the same (Edmondson 2002, 54).

¹³⁵ For more on Roman marriage, see Treggiari (1991).

¹³⁶ The *lex Iulia* and the *lex Papia* are often confused in the ancient sources and it can be difficult to determine to which law certain measures belong. Crawford (1996, 801-809) provides a useful discussion of these two laws and the problems surrounding them as well as a reconstruction of the *lex Iulia*; see also Brunt (1971, 558-566).

¹³⁷ *Dig.* 23.2.44. Edwards (1997, 70) suggests that it is possible that references to gladiators and gladiatorial performances were removed from the *Digest*, the main source for these two laws, because

the theatre by the *lex Papia Poppaea*. Seen in the wider context of all of the Augustan social reforms, his measures concerning the presentation of, performance at, and seating at spectacles constituted an important part of his plan to decisively define the social hierarchy, to reinforce the *discrimina ordinum* which had been ignored during the Republic, and to emphasize the importance of marriage and children.¹³⁸ The organization of the audience at spectacles under Augustus did not reflect the true social composition of the city – senators, for example, were greatly over-represented – but instead was one designed according to his political and social desires. He structured the audience in this manner not only to reinforce his policies to the population of Rome but also to present his ideal Roman society to visitors to the city.

The Post-Augustan Principate

The arrangements in the theatre seem to have changed little from the time of Augustus, although Tiberius did permit Livia to sit in the *tribunal* with the Vestal Virgins, an honour which seems to have become the norm for most imperial women in accordance with their status as members of the imperial family.¹³⁹ The visible divisions of the populace by dress became more pronounced under later emperors. Caligula declared that senators were allowed to wear hats in the theatre to protect themselves from the sun and that they could sit on cushions for comfort

munera were banned by Christian emperors.

¹³⁸ For the importance of Augustus to the Roman social structure, see in particular Millar (1977). Rostovtzeff (1926, 47) asserts that Augustus' main goal concerning Roman society was "...to sharpen the edges, to deepen the gulf between the classes and to assign to each its part in the life of the state."

¹³⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 4.16; Antonia, the grandmother of Caligula, and his sisters were given the same privilege in 37 (Dio Cass. 59.3.4) as was Messalina, the wife of Claudius, in 44 (Dio Cass. 60.22.2).

(and that anyone who wished could go barefoot to the games).¹⁴⁰ When German ambassadors at Rome under Nero visited the theatre of Pompey during a performance, they commented upon the *discrimina ordinum* which was striking because of distinctions of dress. After noticing individuals attired in foreign apparel sitting with the senators and being informed that they too were envoys, the Germans took their seats with them.¹⁴¹ At first glance it would appear that Nero, unlike Augustus, gave foreign envoys *prohedria* despite the possibility that they were freedmen. The two German envoys were the leaders of their tribes, however, and the other envoys may have been royalty as well; Augustus had also allowed foreign royalty to sit with members of the *ordo senatorius*. Domitian imposed strict legislation regarding the appearance and seating of *equites* in the theatre (they now had to wear their togas with the *angustus clavus*) since it seems that the arrangement for this *ordo* had at some point fallen into disarray.¹⁴²

Seating arrangements in the amphitheatre under Augustus may not have been as complex as those in the theatre, but through a gradual process his legislation found its full expression in the Flavian amphitheatre. Tacitus relates that at a *munus* in 21 C.E. a *nobilis iuuenis* refused to give up his seat to an ex-praetor.¹⁴³ *Prohedria* for senators was therefore still in effect and the privilege of reserved seating seems to have been extended by this time to the sons of senators,

¹⁴⁰ Dio Cass. 59.7.8; Mart. 14.29.

¹⁴¹ Tac. *Ann.* 13.54. Suetonius' description of the event (*Claud.* 25.5) attributes it to the time of Claudius.

¹⁴² Mart. 5.8, 5.23; Suet. *Dom.* 8.3.

¹⁴³ Tac. *Ann.* 3.31.

giving the *nobilis iuuenis* a reason not to leave his seat.¹⁴⁴ When the farmer Corydon climbs to the back of the Nero's wooden amphitheatre in the Campus Martius, he comes to the seats where the crowds in dark or base attire are watching near the women in the audience, revealing that regulations concerning the seating of women and those not wearing the toga were still enforced.¹⁴⁵ Further down, closest to the arena, sat individuals pressed together in a group whom Corydon identified as either equestrians or *nivei tribuni*.¹⁴⁶ These *tribuni* attired in their white togas could be the *tribuni militum*, soldiers, or the *tribuni plebis*, civilians.¹⁴⁷ Neither of these groups of individuals was numerous enough to deserve special mention by Corydon. E. Rawson suggests instead that *nivei* describes the *plebs togata* in general, and D. van Berchem argues that *tribuni* should be emended to *tribules*, the members of the *tribus*.¹⁴⁸ Corydon describes the seats closest to the marble wall, the senatorial seats on the podium, and says that they are protected by a golden net hung on ivory tusks and a cylinder inlaid with ivory able to turn and drive away the animals in the arena.¹⁴⁹

The construction of the Flavian amphitheatre, begun by Vespasian and dedicated by Titus in 80 C.E., made temporary wooden amphitheatres unnecessary and the Colosseum

¹⁴⁴ The discovery of inscriptions containing *cp*, *ccpp*, and *ci* (*clarissimus puer*, *clarissimi pueri*, and *clarissimus iuuenis*) in the Flavian amphitheatre reveals that at some point after its construction senators' sons were allowed to sit with their fathers (Orlandi 2004, nos. 16.3B, 17.6C, 17.21C, 17.84C, 17.94G, 17.119B, 17.130D, 17.143D, 17.157).

¹⁴⁵ Calp. *Ecl.* 7.26-27. Nero constructed his elaborate wooden amphitheatre in 57 C.E. (Tac. *Ann.* 13.31.1; Plin. *HN* 16.200; Suet. *Ner.* 12.1) but it was destroyed in the great fire of 64 along with the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus (Tac. *Ann.* 15.40; Dio Cass. 62.18).

¹⁴⁶ Calp. *Ecl.* 7.29.

¹⁴⁷ For the *tribuni* as *tribuni militum*, see Edmondson (1996, 89; 2002, 50).

¹⁴⁸ van Berchem 1941-1942, 189-190; Rawson 1987, 95.

became the main venue in which *munera* were held. It was not the first permanent amphitheatre in Italy, nor in fact in Rome (that of Statilius Taurus was built under Augustus), but it overshadowed all others in terms of its size, design, and decoration.¹⁵⁰ The design of the amphitheatre allowed and in fact encouraged the idealized social hierarchy of the state to be displayed effectively at *munera* for the first time. There were four main entrances; the major axis ran east to west and its two entrances opened directly on to the arena, and the minor axis ran north to south and provided access to the two *tribunalia*. The location of these two *tribunalia*, the northern of which was the imperial box and the southern of which was occupied by the Vestal Virgins, female members of the imperial household, and magistrates and other individuals invited to sit with them, was the best in the amphitheatre from which to both see the events of the arena and be seen by the crowd.¹⁵¹ An exterior porch denoted the imperial entrance and just inside was a stuccoed reception hall.¹⁵² Except for the four main entrances the bays of the exterior facade were numbered, beginning at the northern entrance and continuing anti-

¹⁴⁹ Calp. Sic. *Ecl.* 7.49-56.

¹⁵⁰ For Italian amphitheatres see Chapter 2; for the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus see above. Coleman (2003) argues that a structure such as the Flavian amphitheatre was not built by Augustus during his remodelling of Rome because it may have resulted in *odium* in that time of change between the Republic and the Empire. By denying himself the prestige which such an amphitheatre may have brought, he instead received the prestige of not constructing such an overwhelming symbol of his power. There is not space enough here for the full, detailed analysis that the Flavian amphitheatre deserves; see instead, for example, Golvin (1988, 368-80); Edmondson (1996, 90-95); Bomgardner (2000, 9-20); Futrell (2000, 155-161); Gunderson (2003); Hopkins and Beard (2005) for previous bibliography. The following discussion of the architecture of the Colosseum has been condensed from Edmondson (1996, 90-95) and Bomgardner (2000, 9-20).

¹⁵¹ Kolendo 1981, 302.

¹⁵² See Paparatti (1988) for stucco decoration.

clockwise.¹⁵³ These numbers were the initial step in an extremely organized system of access to the *cavea* which allowed the different levels of Roman society to attain their seats relatively quickly and easily, and in the case of the *ordo senatorius*, without coming into contact with the *plebs*.¹⁵⁴

The senators were seated on the podium of the amphitheatre; they would enter through any of the exterior bays and move to the interior walkway from which they would climb up one of twelve stairways and enter onto the podium.¹⁵⁵ The senatorial area in the temporary amphitheatre of Nero as described by Calpurnius Siculus was richly decorated; that of the permanent Flavian amphitheatre would have been as well. A large number of senatorial seating inscriptions from the podium dating to the late empire have been found.¹⁵⁶ Certain priests, such as the Arval Brothers, who were also senators were seated in this area as well and foreign nobility would have been granted the same privilege.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵³ *CIL* VI 32263; Orlandi 2004, no. 12.1.

¹⁵⁴ This process is echoed in amphitheatres in Italy and the western provinces; see Chapter 2.

¹⁵⁵ Bomgardner (2000, 12-13) suggests that the seven rows of marble seats found behind the podium would also have been occupied by the senators who would have been seated according to gradations of status. Edmondson (1996, 91-92) prefers that these seats be allocated instead to the *equites*.

¹⁵⁶ Seating inscriptions from Rome have not been included in the catalogue for the sake of length. Instead full references have been given to Orlandi's monumental 2004 work in which she compiles all known epigraphic texts from the Colosseum, many of which relate to seating. The senatorial inscriptions are compiled by Orlandi (2004) in her catalogues 16 and 17. Inscriptions in Orlandi are here referred to by catalogue number (i.e. Orlandi 14.1). Hübner (1858, 68-71) and Chastagnol (1964, 1966) also discuss the senatorial inscriptions but Orlandi's work is superior, having the advantage of almost forty years of additional discoveries and detailed research. For the epigraphy of the Flavian amphitheatre in general see Orlandi (2004) with bibliography.

¹⁵⁷ Hübner (1858, 62) suggests that Suetonius did not mention priestly colleges in his description of the *lex Iulia theatralis* because priests would have taken their seats in their political role as senators rather than in their religious role. The Arval Brethren were assigned specific amounts of space in three sections of the Flavian amphitheatre upon its construction: *maeniano I*, *meniano* [sic] *summo II*, and *maeniano summo*

The *equites*, *tribuni*, and members of the *decuriae* of the *apparitores* might have been seated on seven marble rows behind the podium but separate from the *ima cavea* or they might have been seated in the *ima cavea* itself.¹⁵⁸ The *ima cavea* could be accessed in two ways: the lower area directly through a staircase from the middle walkway at ground level, and the upper area via a more indirect route up two sets of stairs and through the gallery on the first floor. It is worth noting that the *ima cavea* contained twelve, not fourteen, rows of marble seats whereas the seven rows behind the podium were divided into fourteen *cunei* which may have been in reference to the fourteen equestrian rows in the theatre.¹⁵⁹ The seating for *equites* was differentiated even in the most basic fashion at its inception, when a special area was reserved for those members of the *ordo* who had gone bankrupt. Augustus removed this distinction but divided the seating into age groups; Tacitus mentions that the *cuneus iuniorum* was named the

in ligneis (CIL VI 32363; ILS 5049). Those who were senators would have been seated on the podium; other individuals associated with the Arvals such as clients, freedmen, and slaves would have been seated in the areas appropriate for their social status. For detailed discussion of the Arval Brethren and the difficulties this inscription causes in terms of the nomenclature of the divisions of the *cavea*, see in particular Orlandi (2004, 167-171, no. 13); earlier Hübner (1858, 62-65); Hülsen (1894); Pasoli (1950); Rea (1988, 11-19).

¹⁵⁸ Edmondson (1996, 91-92; 2002, 50) prefers that the seven rows of marble seats be assigned to the *equites* because they would constitute the equivalent of the fourteen rows which this *ordo* was granted in the theatre. Bomgardner (2000, 12-13) argues instead that the *equites* would have occupied the *ima cavea*, as does Futrell (2000, 162). The context of an inscription from the *cavea* referring to *equites Romani* is unknown, although presumably it was reserving a specific amount of space for the *ordo* (CIL 32098b; ILS 5654b; Orlandi 14.2). Another inscription refers to a *decuria* (CIL VI 32098i; Orlandi 14.9). Epigraphic evidence suggests that the type of *decuria* may have been specified in a lost fragment preceding the extant inscription, for example [*viatoribus tribuniciis ex dec]uria [- - -]*, rather than the other way around, [*de]curia[e - - -]* (eg. *viatorum tribuniciorum*).

¹⁵⁹ Space in the Flavian amphitheatre seems, at least in some cases such as for the Arval Brethren, to have been allotted by feet rather than by row or *cuneus*; how this would have affected equestrian seating is unclear (*supra* n. 158; also CIL VI 32098g; CIL VI 32098h; Orlandi 14.7, 14.8, 14.15, 14.18, 14.20).

cuneus Germanici after the death of the prince.¹⁶⁰ There may have been further divisions made in the seating according to the position attained in politics or in the military.

The *media cavea*, the *summa cavea*, and the *summa cavea in ligneis* were accessed through increasingly complex pathways. The *plebs togata* were seated in the *media cavea* and the subdivisions applied by Augustus to the theatrical audience now were able to be fully enforced in the amphitheatrical audience. An inscription from the *cavea* of the Flavian amphitheatre refers to individuals allotted a certain amount of seating space by a *lex* or *plebiscitum*, and it can be assumed that this is the *lex Iulia theatralis*.¹⁶¹ Other inscriptions, dating generally to the time of the construction of the amphitheatre, refer to space assigned to *praetextati* and their *paedagogi*, to *hospites publici* (who under the *lex Iulia theatralis* were removed from the senatorial seats), and to *clientes*.¹⁶² The identity of these *clientes* is unclear. Van Berchem believes that they are the members of the thirty-five urban tribes organized into two groups, the *seniores* or *patres* and the *iuniores* or *liberi*; these individuals were the beneficiaries of the grain dole and thus he considers them the *clientes* of the *princeps*.¹⁶³ This hypothesis depends upon the members of the *plebs togata* being seated by tribe, which causes its own difficulties; it is equally possible that these were clients of a private individual.¹⁶⁴ An area

¹⁶⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 2.83.

¹⁶¹ *CIL* VI 32098a; *ILS* 5654a; Orlandi 14.1.

¹⁶² *Praetextati*: *CIL* VI 32098c; *ILS* 5654c; Orlandi 14.3. *Paedagogi*: *CIL* VI 32098d; *ILS* 5654d; Orlandi 14.4. *Hospites*: *CIL* VI 32098e; *ILS* 5654e; Orlandi 14.5. *Clientes*: *CIL* VI 32098f; *ILS* 5654f; Orlandi 14.6.

¹⁶³ van Berchem 1941-1942, 183-185.

¹⁶⁴ See above for the difficulties of tribal seating. Without the qualifying word(s) which would have followed *client*(*ibus* vel *-es* vel *-ium*) it is impossible to know to which group of individuals this would

was also reserved for members of the community of Gades and individuals from other cities may have also had their own seating.¹⁶⁵ One inscription reserves a seat for a specific individual but the location of his seat is unknown.¹⁶⁶

It was not only through access to the *cavea* and seat location that the Flavian amphitheatre displayed and reinforced the desired social hierarchy. *Dissignatores* were in charge of making sure that people sat only in the seat to which they were entitled.¹⁶⁷ Now that there was a permanent location for imperial *munera*, the emperor could take advantage of the venue to display his beneficence and could attempt to structure the hierarchy through his distribution of gifts and meals. When food was served in the amphitheatre it was organized by social ranking, and the senators and *equites* dined on higher quality meals.¹⁶⁸ The emperor also scattered gift-tickets throughout the audience, some of which had to be given to the members of the *ordo senatorius* and *ordo equester*.¹⁶⁹ It would be appropriate if the prizes which could be collected by the senators were superior to those available for the equestrians, which were in turn superior to those available for the *plebs*.¹⁷⁰

The Circus remained largely unaffected by seating legislation. Under Caligula seats in

refer; Orlandi (2004, 177-178).

¹⁶⁵ *CIL* VI 32098l; *CIL* VI 32098m; Orlandi 14.11a, b. Strabo (3.5.3) states that some of the inhabitants of Gades spent part of the year at Rome and it is thus not surprising that they had their own area in the amphitheatre. Although the *lex Iulia theatralis* as related by Suetonius makes no mention of foreigners, there is both Athenian and Roman precedent for such seating (see above).

¹⁶⁶ *CIL* VI 32098p; Orlandi 14.22. It is possible that this text reserves space for two individuals.

¹⁶⁷ See Chapter 2.

¹⁶⁸ Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.28-50; Suet. *Dom.* 4.5; Edmondson (1996, 95).

¹⁶⁹ Suet. *Dom.* 4.5. For other examples of largesse and food in the theatre and amphitheatre, see Mart. 8.78, 11.31; Dio 49.43.4; Suet. *Ner.* 11.2.

the Circus could be occupied free of charge not only by members of the *plebs* but also by *equites*.¹⁷¹ Whether all seats were free and where the free seats were located is unclear. In order to obtain these free seats people waited in the Circus overnight, and when Caligula drove these crowds out of the venue twenty *equites* were killed, implying that members of the *ordo equester* were just as eager to occupy these seats. Claudius assigned the senators specific seats and Nero did the same for the equestrians, granting them an area in front of that for the people; he also allowed those senators not wishing to wear the toga with the *latus clavus* to sit with the *plebs*. The seats for both *ordines* must have differed in some way from those originally provided for them by Augustus.¹⁷² Women and men not of senatorial or equestrian rank were still seated together.¹⁷³ As had Augustus, later emperors used the imperial box or on occasion watched the chariot races from the balconies of nearby houses.¹⁷⁴

It was upon the theatre and amphitheatre that legislation organizing audiences concentrated rather than the Circus, perhaps because of its less political nature. Beginning in the Republic but cemented under Augustus, audiences in these venues were used as a public representation of the idealized social hierarchy. The placement of spectators within the *cavea* and the grant of reserved seats to certain groups of individuals reflected the social programme

¹⁷⁰ Edmondson 1996, 95.

¹⁷¹ Suet. *Cal.* 26.4.

¹⁷² Suet. *Claud.* 21.3; Dio Cass. 60.7.3-4; Plin. *HN* 8.21; Tac. *Ann.* 15.32. It is unclear whether it was the first fourteen rows of the circus that Nero assigned to the *equites*. The *cavea* was remodelled, with new seats built for the senators over the water channel running around the edge, and the original senatorial seats behind the new ones were assigned to the *equites*. The total number of seats in the circus was increased by Trajan (*CIL* VI 955).

¹⁷³ Juv. 11.202.

undertaken by the ruler at that time, as is demonstrated by the *lex Iulia theatralis* of Augustus.

Audiences in the theatre and amphitheatre were not necessarily meant to reflect society as it was, but rather as the political leaders desired it to be. In Rome this structuring of the audience was designed for the benefit of both the local population and for visitors to the city. In Italy and the provinces the arrangement of spectacular audiences reflected the disparate social and civic hierarchies of individual communities but also, particularly in the East, could be used in the process of creating a local self-identity, one which appears to have been directed almost exclusively at the local inhabitants.

¹⁷⁴ Suet. *Claud.* 4.2, for example.

Chapter 2 - Italy and the Latin Provinces

It is largely from literary sources, and in particular Suetonius, that we know of seating arrangements at spectacular venues in Rome.¹ The evidence for spectator arrangements from Italy, the western provinces, and the eastern provinces, on the other hand, consists almost entirely of epigraphic evidence, the majority of which comprises seating inscriptions from theatres, amphitheatres, and stadia. These texts generally consist of names or offices, sometimes listed together, carved into the seats of venues and reveal that the organization of audience members at spectacles was a concern outside of Rome as well. Since provincial communities had disparate social and civic structures, the seating arrangements in their spectacular venues reflect these differences. Just as in Rome, however, spectator organization could also be influenced by the desires of the local elite. Although, at least in Italy and the western provinces, seating arrangements relied to a certain extent upon policies passed in Rome, the elite of provincial communities were still largely able to structure audiences how they chose.

An Introduction to Seating Inscriptions

Certain factors prevent seating inscriptions from being used to create an all-encompassing picture of audiences in the provinces. These factors are the loss of painted texts, the reuse of seats, the difficulty of dating the inscriptions, the possible inscribing of seats through

¹ The extant epigraphic remains include the seating inscriptions from the Colosseum (Orlandi 2004, nos. 14.1-23, 15.1-14, 16.1-74, 17.1-178), an inscription from the first century C.E. mentioning a *sella curulis* in the Theatre of Pompey (*CIL* VI 41075), and a list from the fourth century of individuals who attempted to take seats to which they were not entitled (*CIL* VI 41328-41330); see also Chapter 1.

personal, and therefore unofficial, means, and finally the locations in which the inscriptions were found. Inscriptions were not the only means by which a seat could be marked as reserved and many seats would presumably have had painted texts, although none have been securely identified.² Communities might have favoured painted texts over inscriptions because of the need to reuse the seats, and their loss creates a gap in the available evidence. Seating inscriptions were more permanent than painted texts and would not require touch-ups over time but it is precisely this permanence which could cause difficulties. The reuse of seats by different individuals or groups necessitated new inscriptions which would have been carved in very close quarters to, if not directly over, earlier texts. The overlay of inscriptions indicating the reuse of seats can be seen for example in the theatre of Aphrodisias and in the amphitheatre of Paris.³ In many cases a seat was reserved because of the prestige of a particular office rather than a particular individual and only the relevant title was inscribed, presenting no obstacle to the reuse of a seat. In more problematic instances, however, both the title of the office and the name of the individual are present.

Different layers of inscriptions on the same seat cause difficulties not only in interpreting the texts but also in dating them. Even texts which have not been carved over or have not deteriorated too greatly cannot in general be securely dated. Those inscriptions which have not been covered by another text may date to a later stage of use of the venue, although, alternatively,

² A possible example of a painted text may be found on a seat in the amphitheatre of Tarragona (Mayer and Massó 1990, 173, no. 36).

³ 65, 38.

the practice of inscribing seats might have been discontinued before the venue ceased to be used.

It can be very difficult to determine which of two superimposed texts is the later, and two separate inscriptions found side by side on the same seat cannot be taken to be contemporaneous, nor can two inscriptions on different seats next to one another. In some cases inscriptions are found both on the horizontal seat base and the vertical rise of a seat, seemingly indicating different periods of occupation. The lack of certainty surrounding the date of seating inscriptions – and here it must be emphasized that all the inscriptions from a particular venue cannot be assumed to date to the same period – prevents these texts from being used to provide a snapshot of the audience at a particular moment.

Another obstacle presented by seating inscriptions involves the difficulty of determining whether the texts were carved due to an official mandate or instead by an individual of his or her own volition, that is, whether the grant of a seat was official or did not occur at all. Of the hundreds of texts inscribed on the seats of the stadium of Didyma, for example, A. Rehm was only able to identify a small number as official with any degree of certainty.⁴ There are some clues, although they are not foolproof, that an inscription was most likely official: elegant lettering, an original location closer to the front of the *cavea*, and a formula such as *datus decreto*. Another indication that a text was inscribed by official mandate rather than through personal will is if it was stretched across an entire row. Inscriptions carved across a full row were more likely to be official since they were meant to reserve a larger area for a specific group. The final

difficulty presented by seating inscriptions is that they and the seats upon which they were carved are often found *ex situ*. In some useful cases the seats are still largely in their original location in the *cavea*, for example in the stadium of Aphrodisias, the theatre of Stobi, the amphitheatre of Nîmes, and the amphitheatre of Pola.⁵ In others, such as the theatre of Aphrodisias, because of the collapse of the *cavea* seating blocks were displaced when it was rebuilt.⁶ In some instances the *cavea* collapsed and was not reconstructed, resulting in seating blocks being scattered throughout the venue. In still other cases, such as in the theatre of Delphi, blocks with seating inscriptions are no longer in the theatre at all, sometimes because of the later plundering of the venue for building materials.⁷ Several texts from the theatre of Stobi were found in a nearby church and inscriptions from the amphitheatre of Paris were found in a wall surrounding the venue.⁸

Such are the difficulties presented by the texts collected for this study. It must be noted that their collection is dependent upon their publication, and many other seating inscriptions from venues throughout the Roman Empire remain undiscovered, or at least unpublished. Even some inscriptions that have been published can be of limited use in creating a seating plan since their exact location in the *cavea* is not noted by the author. In these cases it is clear only that a seat was reserved for the individual or group indicated in the text, but not where the seat was located. The

⁴ Rehm 1958, 102.

⁵ 67; 7, 8; 30, 31, 32; 23.

⁶ 65.

⁷ 6.

⁸ 7, 8; 38, 39.

discussion in the Chapters that follow is therefore based only upon the available evidence.

These obstacles aside, and without the expectation that seating inscriptions can be used to create a definite seating plan for a particular moment in time, these texts are still of great value. They can be used to study the changes in the civic organization of a community over time. In the theatre of Stobi, for example, the names of families were inscribed over those of tribes suggesting that while the audience originally took its seats according to tribal affiliation, this gave way instead to familial ties.⁹ In eastern venues the location of seating inscriptions can suggest changes in the social structure from the Hellenistic period to the Roman period, such as in the theatre of Termessus where texts are found mostly only in the Augustan additions to the auditorium.¹⁰ Not just the location, but also the content of inscriptions in eastern venues can reflect the transition from the Hellenistic to the Roman periods. Tribal names can reveal Roman influence, such as in the odeon of Gerasa where a tribe is named after the emperor Hadrian.¹¹ The presence of Roman priesthoods in seating inscriptions from the theatre of Athens provides a contrast to the more traditional priesthoods listed.¹² Seating inscriptions not only provide the names of offices and associations found in the community but can be used to determine the importance of these groups within the local civic structure. To provide only two examples, in the theatre of Dionysus in Athens the priest of Dionysus was given a central seat in the front row, a location appropriate for the priest of the god to whom the theatre was dedicated, and in the

⁹ 7, 8; see Chapter 3.

¹⁰ 77; see Chapter 3.

¹¹ 80.10, .12; see Chapter 3.

amphitheatre of Nîmes the *nautae*, integral to the economy of the city, had their own seats on the podium.¹³ Seating inscriptions from venues in different cities and regions of the empire can be compared to reveal similarities or differences, and inscriptions from different venues in the same city, such as the theatre and odeon of Aphrodisias, can be compared to provide clues for their possible use.¹⁴ Texts from a single venue are also capable of providing insight into its function. In the amphitheatre of Lyon, a setting integral to the meetings of the *Tres Galliae*, envoys from various *civitates* were given reserved seats.¹⁵ A comparison between the arrangements in the provinces and those in Rome can suggest the extent to which legislation passed in Rome, in particular the *lex Iulia theatralis*, affected provincial towns.

The arrangement of audiences within provincial spectacular venues can also provide insight into how each community wished to present itself. The organization of spectators within the *caveae* of provincial venues served the same function that it did in Rome, to present a static display of society in a very public manner. The composition of this display depended, of course, upon the motivation of those who were in charge of organizing it. In Rome the *senatus consultum* of 194 B.C.E. providing senators with their own seats, the *lex Roscia theatralis* of 67 B.C.E. in favour of equestrians, and the *lex Iulia theatralis* of Augustus were the main legislative acts that organized seating but arrangements were made under later emperors as well.¹⁶ The acts

¹² 1, 2; see Chapter 3.

¹³ 1.1c; 30.3-4.

¹⁴ 65, 66; see Chapter 4.

¹⁵ 36.1, .2, .3, 37.6; see Chapter 4.

¹⁶ See Chapter 1.

of the Arval Brethren, for example, reveal that its members were assigned space in different areas of the *cavea* of the Flavian amphitheatre. The senatorial priests were seated on the podium while others involved with the Brethren such as clients, freedmen, and slaves had seats in different sections of the audience. One individual responsible for assigning seats to the Arvals was Laberius Maximus, on record as the *praefectus annonae* in 81 C.E., who may have simultaneously been holding another office such as *procurator* of the amphitheatre.¹⁷ The rules of seating were enforced, not only in the Flavian amphitheatre but in other venues in Rome, by *dissignatores*. These individuals were responsible for leading certain spectators to their seats and also for ensuring that audience members did not attempt to sit in seats other than their own, particularly in those belonging to spectators of a higher social status.¹⁸ Several epigrams of Martial mention two *dissignatores* of the Flavian amphitheatre, Leitus and Oceanus, and their efforts to control seating; incursions into the equestrian fourteen rows by freedmen or others not entitled to this privilege are mentioned most often by ancient authors.¹⁹

Outside of Rome, at least in Italy and the West, the members of the local elite were to a certain degree influenced, and constrained, by the arrangements in Rome. The organization of seating arrangements fell to the local decurions in the West or to the town council in eastern

¹⁷ Orlandi 2004, 168-169; Kolendo 1981, 304 n. 26. For more on the Arval Brethren and seating legislation in Rome see Chapter 1.

¹⁸ Plaut. *Poen.* II. 19-22.

¹⁹ These are the only names that Martial provides, which seems to indicate that these individuals might have been servile. Mart. 5.8, 5.14, 5.23, 5.25; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 4.15-16; Suet. *Aug.* 14.

communities.²⁰ Roman legislation such as the *lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* was passed concerning spectator arrangement for certain communities, and seats were to be reserved throughout the empire for senators and perhaps also for equestrians, but the local council or *ordo decurionum* had a certain amount of freedom.²¹ The *lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* itself provides the *decuriones* of the colony of Urso, Spain, with the somewhat limited ability to choose with whom they wished to be seated.²² Although in a decree from Smyrna in Asia Minor the local council obtained the governor's acquiescence to a grant of seats to an association of porters, it seems as though this was merely a symbolic, rather than a necessary, prerequisite.²³

The desire for at least a minimal amount of order and organization in spectacular venues was not limited to the capital. Inscriptions for *dissignatores* in Trea in Italy and in Corduba, Spain, indicate that this position was filled throughout the western provinces.²⁴ The text of the foundation of Gaius Iulius Demosthenes, a leading citizen of Oenoanda in Lycia, Asia Minor, reveals that during the agonistic festival he established under Hadrian *magistophoroi* were in

²⁰ As two examples, an inscription from the Ager Beneventanus seems to indicate that a Publius Camurus Gemellus was granted a seat in a *tribunal* with the permission of the decurions (*CIL* IX 2093), and the council of Smyrna was involved in granting seats to a group that appears to be a professional association (*IK* 24.1, no. 717; van Nijf 1997, 221).

²¹ Suet. *Aug.* 44.1. For the extent to which legislation passed in Rome concerning audiences in the city and not expressly mentioned as being applicable to the provinces was enacted outside of the city see below.

²² *CIL* II 5439, Chapter 125; Crawford 1996, no. 25; Crawford 1993; see below.

²³ *IK* 24.1, no. 713; van Nijf 1997, 221-222; see also Chapter 3 for the role of the local council. In this inscription which dates to 225 C.E. the council assigns four seats in a row to the porters called Ἀσκληπιάσται; this grant was confirmed by the proconsul Lollianus Avitus.

²⁴ *CIL* II²/7 345; *AE* 2000, 495.

charge of keeping order in the theatre.²⁵ The assignation of seats was largely an internal decision of each community and it reflects both the discrepant social and civic composition of communities throughout the empire and also the social and civic hierarchy that the local elite wished to display.

Seating Arrangements in Italy and the West before Augustus

Many eastern cities could rely upon a history of *prohedria* for spectator arrangements but most of Italy and the West had no such precedent.²⁶ When a senator in Puteoli could not find a seat at busy games, Augustus was prompted to have a *senatus consultum* passed decreeing that wherever games were held senators to were be given the front row or rows. A few years later he passed the *lex Iulia theatralis* to organize seating both in Rome and to a certain extent in the provinces as well.²⁷ Although this legislation affected seating in Italy and the western provinces there is pre-Augustan evidence for organized seating in these areas. The main source for these arrangements is the *lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* (also known as the *lex Ursonensis*) from Urso, Spain, dating to shortly after the death of Caesar.²⁸ This *lex* addresses seating not only for senators visiting the colony but also for the local *ordo* of decurions.

The decurions were the members of the third upper *ordo* of Roman society, but it was

²⁵ Il. 64; the lines provided for the inscription are those assigned by Wörrle (1988). For more on Demosthenes' festival see Chapter 3.

²⁶ For seating in the East, see Chapter 3.

²⁷ Suet. *Div. Aug.* 44. For the *lex Iulia theatralis* and its application in Rome, see Chapter 1; for its application in Italy and the western provinces, see below.

²⁸ *CIL* II 5439; Crawford 1996, no. 25.

not an empire-wide order as were those of the senators and equestrians. Each town in Italy and the western empire had its own autonomous decurional order made up of the local elite who were responsible for city administration. Its members were generally ex-magistrates, usually former quaestors or aediles, although on occasion non-magistrates could be adlected into the order by the censors to fill places emptied by death.²⁹ While in principle the decurional order was not one of birth, during the early empire examples can be found of a family belonging to the order for several generations since the sons of decurions inherited the property of their fathers.³⁰ There was a minimum property qualification for the decurional order, as there was for the senatorial and equestrian orders, but the amount varied from city to city based upon the size and wealth of each locality; the social status of the *ordo decurionum* therefore differed from city to city. Though all decurions did have to meet the local census qualification, it could be rather low and thus many members would have been rich only by local standards.³¹ As a result there were great differences in the wealth and origin of the decurions throughout Italy and the West. The size of the *ordo* also varied from town to town depending upon the size of the local population.³² The *ordo decurionum* of each town was integral to local civic life and its members were rewarded, as were those of the senatorial and equestrian orders, with elevated social status including insignia

²⁹ Stevenson 1939, 171; Garnsey 1971, 315-317.

³⁰ Alföldy 1985, 127.

³¹ In some larger cities such as Comum in northern Italy the census was set at 100,000 sesterces (Plin. *Ep.* 1.19.2) but in small municipalities it could be as low as 20,000 sesterces (Alföldy 1985, 127-128).

³² Although the size of the order is generally given as approximately one hundred individuals (for example Abbott and Johnson (1926, 65); Stevenson (1939, 171); Duncan-Jones (1974, 283, 287); Hopkins (1974, 103); MacMullen (1974, 90)), the use of this figure as a standard number is not entirely secure (see Nicols (1988) on the whether a standard size for the *ordo* can in fact be determined).

and privileged seating at spectacles.³³

Chapter 125 of the *lex Ursonensis* provides for reserved seats at all spectacles in the colony for both local and Roman magistrates, local decurions, and any others whom the decurions chose. The right of local pontiffs and augurs to sit with the decurions at public *ludi* and gladiatorial competitions is mentioned in an earlier Chapter of this law.³⁴ A section of the *Tabula Heracleensis*, dating to 45 B.C.E. and applicable not only to *coloniae* but also to *municipia*, *praefecturae*, *fora*, and *conciliabula*, mentions reserved seating for decurions at *ludi* and gladiatorial presentations.³⁵ Chapter 126 of the *lex Ursonensis* deals with seating at theatrical shows only, legislating that *coloni*, *incolae*, *hospites*, and *adventores* were to be seated according to a decree of the decurions. The division of the audience members in this fashion reveals that it was the status of *colonus* that was the important factor in general audience arrangement at Urso and at other *coloniae* as well. In Telesia in Italy, for example, Lucius Manlius Rufius put on *ludi scaenici* and gave a public banquet to the local *coloni* and *incolae*.³⁶

³³ Although there were marked differences between the *ordines* of each city, its members had uniform roles. They had to pay a *summa honoraria* and, along with the rich freedmen of the community (many of whom were *Augustales*), they would have met most of the local public expenditure. Decurions also administered the cities in the areas of justice, finance, the food supply, public order, and construction (Alföldy 1985, 129). Garnsey (1971) suggests that an entry fee was paid only by the *adlecti* until the first part of the second century, at which time a more general *summa honoraria* was imposed because the financial responsibilities of the decurions, as opposed to their administrative duties, were being given greater emphasis. For more on the decurional order and the local elite of provincial communities, see for example Abbott and Johnson (1926, 64-68); Duncan-Jones (1974, 283-287); Millar (1983); Curchin (1990); Demougin (1994b); Pintado (2001); Melchor Gil and Rodríguez Neila (2001).

³⁴ Chapter 66. A distinction is made in this Chapter and others, as well as in the *Tabula Heracleensis* (ll. 136-141), between *ludi* and *gladiatores*, which indicates that gladiatorial competitions were not part of the official *ludi* (Crawford 1996, 435).

³⁵ ll. 136-141. *CIL* I² 593; *ILS* 6058; Crawford 1996, no. 24.

³⁶ *CIL* IX 2252.

Each community was an independent unit and the larger size of the venues relative to the local population made the distinction between *coloni*, *incolae*, *hospites*, and *adventores* necessary.³⁷ *Coloni* must have been granted better, and most likely more, seats than *incolae*, who must in turn have been favoured over *adventores*. Most, but not all, individuals from outside the colony who were present for the spectacle would have been given the poorest seats no matter their status in their home town since they played no role in the sociopolitical life of Urso.³⁸ The decurions of Urso and presumably of other communities at this time were allowed, however, to choose those individuals with whom they wished to be seated and it seems more than likely that a decurion from a neighbouring town would be among those selected. Although *hospites* were also not from the *colonia*, as official guests surely they would have had seats closer to the stage than *adventores*. The importance of this distinction between audience members in each community is revealed by the fact that it is also found outside of the spectacular context. In Interamnia in central Italy baths were constructed for *municipes*, *coloni*, *incolae*, *hospites*, and *adventores*, and similar examples have been found elsewhere in Italy and in Cisalpine Gaul.³⁹

Chapter 127 of the *lex Coloniae Genetivae* addresses seating in the orchestra of the theatre in particular. The individuals granted this privilege were Roman and local magistrates, past, present, and future Roman senators and their sons, the serving *praefectus fabrum*, local decurions, and individuals whom the decurions deemed appropriate. In his discussion of the

³⁷ Futrell 2000, 164.

³⁸ Kolendo 1981, 306.

³⁹ Interamnia: *CIL* IX 5074, 5075; other examples: *CIL* V 376, 6668; XI 6167; XIV 2978, 2979;

planning of theatres, Vitruvius takes the seating of decurions in the orchestra of the theatre for granted.⁴⁰ The *lex Ursonensis*, while controlling the seating arrangements of the colony, still provides local decurions with a certain amount of independence.⁴¹ They were allowed to decide who, other than individuals stipulated by legislation, was to sit with them at all spectacles and they could organize the general audience members at theatrical presentations how they chose as long as the distinction between *coloni*, *incolae*, *hospites*, and *adventores* was generally observed. The one area in which the *lex* does not allow flexibility is the seating of Roman senators and magistrates, highlighting that the provision of separate seats for senators in 194 B.C.E. (later reinforced by the *senatus consultum* passed under Augustus) was meant to have been extended throughout the provinces; this practice may also have served as a model for the seating of local decurions and magistrates.⁴² The *lex Roscia theatralis* was also observed outside of Rome and by 43 B.C.E. in Gades, Spain, a *municipium civium Romanorum*, the first fourteen rows were reserved for local *equites*.⁴³

Two inscriptions from Capua in Italy provide further evidence for pre-Augustan seating arrangements. A decree of the *pagus Herculaneus*, dated to 94 B.C.E. and passed under the direction of the *magister pagi*, instructs the local *collegium* of *Iovis Compagus* to repair a public portico. In return for this beneficence the twelve *magistri Iovei Compagei*, all of whom were

also Kolendo 1981, n. 36.

⁴⁰ Vitr. *de arch.* 5.6.2.

⁴¹ Compare the detailed arrangements of the *lex Ursonensis* to Chapter 81 of the *lex Imitana*, below.

⁴² Crawford 1996, 240.

freedmen, were to receive a *locus in teatro* as if they had provided theatrical exhibitions.⁴⁴

Although *locus* here is in the singular it must refer to an area in the theatre for all twelve of the *magistri* rather than merely for a representative. Another, albeit fragmentary, inscription from the same time period is of a similar nature. A series of individuals who can all be identified as *liberti* are named, reference is made to theatrical structures which they either repaired or constructed, and although the names of the *consuls* are lost, the date upon which theatrical exhibitions were presented is identified.⁴⁵ This inscription and the one above follow a general pattern of which just under thirty examples remain, all from Campania. They include the name of the group (lost in the second inscription) such as the *magistri* of *Iovis Compagus*, of *Castor et Pollux et Mercurius Felix*, or of *Spes, Fides*, and *Fortuna*, the names of the members (many of whom were freedmen), the work (whether the repair of an existing structure or the construction of a new one) that was carried out, and the sponsorship of *ludi* and the year in which they were held.⁴⁶ It

⁴³ Cic. *ad Fam.* 10.32.2; Strabo 3.5.3.

⁴⁴ CIL I² 682, X 3772; *ILLRP* 719; cf. Boak 1916, 28-30; Frederiksen 1984, no. 17; Chamberland 2001, no. 60: *Pagus Herculaneus scivit a. d. X Termina[lia]: / conlegium seive magistrei Iovei compagei s[unt] / utei in porticum paganam reficiendam / pequniam consumerent ex lege pagana / arbitrato Cn. Laetori Cn. f. magistrei / pagei{ei}uteique ei conlegio seive magistri / sunt Iovei Compagei locus in teatro / esset tamqua(m) sei {sei} lu'd'os fecissent / L. Aufustius L. l. Strato, C. Antonius M. l. / Nico, Cn. Avius Cn. l. Agathocles, C. Blossi(ius) / M. l. Protemus, M. Raminus P. l. Diopant(us) / T. Sulpicius P. Q. Pu(pi) l., Q. Novius Q. l. Protem(us) / M. Paccius M. l. Philem(o), M. Licculeius M. l. / Philin(us), Cn. Hordeonius Cn. l. Euphemio / A. Pollius P. l. Alexand(er), N. Munnius N. l. / Antiochus, C. Coelio C. f. Caldo / [L.] Domitio Cn. f. Ahenobarb(o) cos.*

⁴⁵ CIL I² 2506; *ILLRP* 713; cf. Frederiksen 1984, 282 no. 15; Chamberland 2001, no. 59: [- - - - / - - -] *Epic(adus?)*, / [- - -] *cl(- - -)*, / *Q. Annius Q. l. Fe[- - -]*, / *P. Bivellius T. l. [- - -]*, / *P. Messius Q. l. [- - -]*, / *C. Lusius C. l. [- - -]*, / *P. Oivus P. l. Plut(us)*, / *C. Antonius C. l. [- - -]* : / **[heisce magistreis - - - tr]eib(unal)**, / **cuniu(m) muliereb[us - - - / - - -]** ludosq(ue) fecerun[t - - - / - - -]o cos.

⁴⁶ The order in which these elements appeared varied. *Castor et Pollux et Mercurius Felicis*: CIL I² 2947, Frederiksen 1984, no. 10; *Spes Fides Fortuna*: CIL I² 674, Frederiksen 1984, no. 3. Frederiksen (1984, 281-284) contains a complete list of these inscriptions.

appears as though these *magistri* were *curatores fanorum*, individuals who, having paid a *summa honoraria*, were appointed to look after local shrines and to undertake civic duties that elsewhere would have been handled by official magistrates.⁴⁷

These boards provided *liberti*, legally unable to become members of the three upper *ordines* because of their servile origin, with their own seats in the theatre. The reservation of seats for *liberti* happened rarely in Rome during the Republic, and when it did occur it was on an individual basis rather than because of membership in a particular group. It was possible that a *libertus* could be granted the status of *eques* because of personal merit and could therefore sit in the fourteen rows, but in most cases they obtained seats through unofficial means.⁴⁸ In 25 B.C.E., the *tribunus plebis* Gaius Toranius brought his father, a freedman, with him into the theatre to sit upon the tribunes' bench.⁴⁹ Wealthy *liberti* who were able to meet the equestrian census requirement of 400,000 sesterces and present themselves as *equites* by wearing the gold ring often seated themselves in the equestrian area without permission.⁵⁰ The opportunity for reserved, and perhaps rather good, seats in the theatre that membership on the Campanian boards of *magistri* offered freedmen during the Republic was echoed after Augustus in Italian and western cities by that offered to *Augustales* (below).

⁴⁷ Frederiksen 1984, 264-268.

⁴⁸ Dio Cass. 47.7.4-5: Octavian enrolled the freedman Philopoemen among the *equites* for helping to save the life of Titus Vinius, one of the proscribed.

⁴⁹ Dio Cass. 53.27.6. Even though he was flouting social conventions Gaius Torianus acquired a good reputation because of this incident because it expressed his sense of duty and devotion to his father. The exact location of the bench of the tribunes is unclear.

⁵⁰ Augustus attempted to repress, among other things, the frequency of this type of social climbing by setting a limit on manumission (Suet. *Aug.* 40.3) and preventing, in the *lex Iulia theatralis*, *hospites* from

In the second Capuan inscription mentioned above, the *magistri* from an unknown *collegium* provided funds for work to be done in the theatre, either to repair or build a *tribunal* and a *cuneus*. The fragmentary nature of the text makes its precise interpretation difficult but it is striking that the *cuneus* identified in the inscription as a *cunius*(s) *muliereb(us)* appears to have been meant for women in particular. It is possible that within this *cuneus* there was a certain degree of internal stratification, that is, that the wives of decurions would have been seated at the front of the audience while those women of a lower social status were seated closer to the back, but there is no proof of this. The placement of women in their own area was a very different arrangement from that in Republican Rome where women and men were seated together, other than the wives of senators and *equites* who, at least in the theatre, appear to have been seated separately from their husbands.⁵¹ The only clear reference to seating for women outside of Rome in the Republic comes from Vitruvius who recommends that the site of a theatre be chosen for health reasons for those attending together with their wives and children.⁵² If indeed this inscription from Capua can be interpreted as referring to a *cuneus* for women only, the most likely precedent for this segregation may come from Capua's Hellenic heritage. The presence of women in the classical Athenian theatre has been debated but the ancient testimony seems to indicate that they did attend.⁵³ The Athenian system of seating, including the segregation of

sitting in the orchestra with the senators after learning that they could be *liberti*; see Chapter 1.

⁵¹ Chapter 1.

⁵² Vitr. *De arch.* 5.3.1. For Vitruvian theatre design, see Sear (1990); Gros (1994b). Post-Augustan evidence for the location of women in Italian and Western audiences is only somewhat less elusive (below).

⁵³ See Chapter 3; also Haigh (1889, 297-302); Pickard-Cambridge (1968, 264-265, 269); Podlecki

women, may have travelled to Rome via Campania and the Capuan inscription may be evidence of this movement.⁵⁴ Women also appear to have been separated in the theatre of Interamna Nahars, modern Terni in Italy. At the end of the Republic two *quattuorviri* adorned this venue with bronze ornaments *in mulierebus*, seemingly in the area of the theatre devoted to women.⁵⁵ It seems that during the Republic women were segregated in the audience of certain communities outside of Rome.

The body of evidence for pre-Augustan seating arrangements in Italy and the West is small compared to that dating after his death and does not allow a detailed seating plan to be constructed. What it suggests is that audience organization in the provinces was a concern before the *lex Iulia theatralis*. Legislation passed in Rome during the Republic regarding the seating of senators and equestrians was not only meant to be implemented outside of the city, it might also have served as a model for the seating of local decurions. One of the provisions of the statute passed upon the creation of a *colonia* or *municipium* regulated seating, as is revealed by the *lex Ursonensis*; the same concern can later be seen in the Flavian *lex Irnitana* (below). The organization of audiences before Augustus also highlights the differences not only between communities outside of Rome and Rome itself, but also those between individual communities.

(1990); Henderson (1991); Goldhill (1994); Katz (1998).

⁵⁴ For seating in the theatre of Athens see Chapter 3. Schnurr (1992, 151-154) suggests that the seating arrangements dictated by the *lex Iulia theatralis* most likely came directly from Greece whereas Rawson (1987, 90) argues that they may equally have arrived in Rome via Campania. In Campania a thriving Hellenistic culture had been established and the adaptation of certain elements of Athenian seating in this area would not be impossible.

⁵⁵ *CIL* XI 4206; Jouffroy 1986, 57.

Membership in the boards of Campanian *magistri* provided *liberti* with an opportunity that they were denied at Rome. It is possible that women were seated separately in the Capuan theatre, different from the largely mixed seating at Rome; they seem also to have been separated in at least one venue north of Rome. A Roman senator was a Roman senator no matter where he went and was immediately guaranteed a seat in the best area of the theatre or amphitheatre. Visiting decurions might have been granted the privilege of sitting with local decurions, but this was because of personal invitation rather than official legislation. Horizontal links between the provincial elite might in most cases have taken precedence over vertical divisions between audience members. Since the members of each local *ordo decurionum* could choose specific individuals with whom they wished to be seated, the composition of spectators around the decurions would have varied to a certain degree from community to community. As is revealed by the *lex Ursonensis*, Roman regulations passed before Augustus could not, and indeed did not try to, prevent a small amount of variation in audience organization.

Augustan and post-Augustan evidence

Augustus was prompted by the *iniuria* of a senator in Puteoli for whom no one would provide a seat at busy games to have a *senatus consultum* passed ensuring that wherever and whenever public shows were held, the first row of seats would be left vacant for visiting senators.⁵⁶ Although Suetonius states that Augustus then turned his attentions to seating in

⁵⁶ Suet. *Div. Aug* 44.

Rome, his concern for audience organization was clearly not limited to the capital. The observance throughout Roman territory of the *senatus consultum* passed in 194 B.C.E. for senators and the legislation passed in 67 B.C.E. for *equites* is discussed above; it seems that the *lex Iulia theatralis* was also meant to be extended in some fashion throughout the empire. The different civic and social structures of communities in Italy and the western provinces made the direct application of his legislation impossible, but it is clear that seating arrangements at spectacles were an integral part of life after Augustus.

The renovations carried out on the large theatre of Pompeii provide early proof of the result of the *lex Iulia theatralis* outside of Rome. In 3/2 B.C.E. Marcus Holconius Rufus and Marcus Holconius Celer funded the enlargement of the *crypta* around the top of the second century theatre and constructed new rows of seats distinct from the original *cavea*.⁵⁷ Audience members could only approach these new seats, completely disconnected from the older rows, from outside the theatre. This new area might have been intended for those individuals whom Augustus had relegated to the back of the audience, namely slaves, the poor, most likely women, and perhaps also visitors from outside Pompeii. The work on the *crypta* also meant that the *ima* and *media cavea* now had separate entranceways; the twenty rows of the *media cavea* could be accessed from six new doors in the *crypta*, leaving the entrance into the orchestra only for those for whom there were seats reserved on the four rows of *subsellia*.⁵⁸ At some point after the

⁵⁷ *CIL* X 833-834. Celer may have been Rufus' son (Zanker 1998, 109).

⁵⁸ Zanker 1998, 108, 113; see the discussion of Plautus' *Poenulus* in Chapter 1 for the term *subsellium*.

renovations the seats of the *cavea* were numbered. On the eleventh row of the first *maenianum* survive the numbers *XIII*, *XIV*, and *XV*; these seats were delineated by a vertical line and measured 0.39 m in width.⁵⁹ The Holconii also constructed two *tribunalia* over the *parodoi*, in which the individual presiding at the games would sit, as is revealed in an inscription from Cumae; in Rome, one of the *tribunalia* would be occupied by the magistrate sponsoring the spectacles and anyone else with whom he wished to be seated.⁶⁰ An inscription on a seat in the centre of the first row behind the *subsellia* lists the complete *cursus honorum* of Marcus Holconius Rufus.⁶¹ In the middle of the inscription was space for a monument to be attached, and P. Zanker suggests that it was a bronze *sella curulis* which would have been a symbol of Holconius Rufus' prominent position in Pompeii that was clearly visible to all audience members.⁶² The renovations to the Pompeian theatre, a venue that had been adequate for the Pompeians for over a century, resulted in a venue capable of displaying the social hierarchy of the town more effectively as outlined under the *lex Iulia theatralis*.⁶³

⁵⁹ Formigé 1914, 32; Golvin 1988, 353.

⁶⁰ *AE* 1927, 158; Sherk 1970, no. 41. See Chapter 1.

⁶¹ *CIL* X 838.

⁶² M. Holconius Rufus was perhaps the most important citizen of Pompeii under Augustus. He would have begun his political career in approximately 20 B.C.E., since by the time the inscription was engraved in the theatre he had served as duumvir four times, as *quinquennalis* once, and had been awarded the honorary title of *tribunus militum a populo* by the emperor even though he had limited or no military experience. This position would have entitled him to a seat in the fourteen rows of the *equites* when he visited the theatre in Rome (Zanker 1998, 112). Holconius Rufus had also held the office of priest in the cult of the emperor (*sacerdos Augusti*) and had been named *patronus coloniae*.

⁶³ A series of painted inscriptions on the arches on the exterior of the Pompeian amphitheatre that grant individuals a *locus* by permission of the aediles at first glance appear to be related to seating (*CIL* IV 1096, 1096a, 1097, 1097a, 1097b). They should instead be taken as indicating spaces available outside during spectacles that were granted to vendors by the aediles; their location on the outside of the amphitheatre does not suggest an immediate link with the arrangements in the *cavea* (Kolendo 1981, 303).

Unfortunately, a detailed legislative source for post-Augustan seating arrangements in Italy and the West such as the Republican *lex Coloniae Genetivae* does not exist. The Flavian *lex Imitana* created for the new *municipia* of Baetica mentions seating only briefly.⁶⁴ Chapter 81 states that in whatever seats each group of men watched the games before the statute was passed, they were to watch them in the same place as long as it was legislated in a decurional decree. The *lex* also provides that the audience was to be organized in a fashion that was allowed under present and future statutes, plebiscites, or decrees of the senate or edicts or judgements of emperors from Augustus to Domitian, most likely including the *lex Iulia theatralis*. This clause outlines, in effect, a seating plan whose details must have been familiar to the *municipium* but are unclear to modern readers of the *lex*.

The main body of evidence for Augustan and post-Augustan seating in Italy and the West is epigraphic, found on the seats of the venues themselves. These inscriptions reveal that the division of audience members according to the local social hierarchy was as important as it was in Rome. The evidence can best be divided into numeration within the venues and inscriptions from the seats of venues bearing reservations for individuals or for offices and groups.

⁶⁴ See González (1986) for analysis and translation of this *lex*.

Numeration within venues

Audience members in Italian and western venues were subject to the influence of the local social hierarchy even before they obtained their seats. Spectators were guided through the venues by numbers inscribed or painted over the entrances which were meant to ensure that they could obtain their seats easily and in an organized fashion, a large component of which was ensuring that individuals of a different social status used different routes. This differentiation of a route began as soon as an audience member arrived, such as in the amphitheatre of Verona where the seventy-two external *fornici* were identified with numbers, and continued as he made his way through the venue.⁶⁵ Internal passageways, *vomitatoria*, and *cunei* could all be identified to facilitate crowd movement.⁶⁶ This process was made easier by the use of *tesserae* which functioned as tickets.⁶⁷ A bone *tessera* from the theatre of Pompeii assigns its holder a seat in the second *cavea* (presumably the *media cavea*), the third *cuneus*, and the seventh *gradus*, and another from the Arles amphitheatre assigns a seat in the *media cavea*, the fifth *cuneus*, and the tenth *gradus*.⁶⁸ On a bilingual *tessera* from the theatre of Issa in Croatia is inscribed XV

⁶⁵ *EAOR* II 71; *CIL* V 3455. Of the seventy-two *fornici*, the only securely identified of the sixteen remaining texts are thirty-nine, forty-two, and sixty-four through sixty-seven. This echoes the arrangement in the Colosseum where twenty-nine of the thirty-three entrances on the eastern side are also marked with numbers (Orlandi 2004, no. 12.1; see Chapter 1).

⁶⁶ Such as in the amphitheatres of Arles (Formigé 1965, 36), Puteoli (Maiuri 1955, 56-59; *AE* 1956, 139), and Cenomanni (*CIL* XIII 3192).

⁶⁷ *Tesserae* were round, coin-like objects made of lead, wood, or bone. A *tessera* from Issa is 3 cm in diameter; in general they would have been approximately the same size. The identity of these objects has been disputed (see van Berchem (1936) for example) but many are generally accepted to have functioned as theatre and amphitheatre entrance tickets.

⁶⁸ Golvin 1988, 353-354.

ΠΟΛΥΔΕΥΚ ΙΕ, denoting the fifteenth row in the sector of Polydeuces.⁶⁹ Another area of the theatre was most likely named after his twin Castor, others may have been named after different deities, local heroes, or civic tribes.⁷⁰ The use of both the Greek and Latin reflects the status of Issa, an independent colony of Syracuse which in 47 B.C.E. became a Roman *municipium*. In order for the distribution of these *tesserae* to have been effective, their number must have corresponded closely to the number of seats in the venue.⁷¹

The final step was the arrival of the spectator at his seat, and in some venues the seats themselves were identified by number.⁷² In the amphitheatre of Verona, for example, a specific seat is identified as being found in *cuneus I, locus IIII, linea I*.⁷³ It seems that in this inscription *locus* was not meant to identify the seat but rather an area and *linea* was the specific indication of where the individual was to sit. In general, however, a *locus* was the equivalent of a seat and was the term used in seating inscriptions as part of the reservation formula.⁷⁴ It appears as though seats in different venues were numbered both left to right and right to left, and individual seats

⁶⁹ Inventory no. K1258, Arheološki Muzej, Split; in the catalogue “Actores y Público” in *El Teatro Romano La Puesta en Escena*, Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza, 2003.

⁷⁰ In the theatre of Syracuse one *cuneus* was named after Zeus and others were named after the kings of the city and their wives (Dilke 1948, 184). For the seating of civic tribes in the Greek areas of the empire see Chapter 3.

⁷¹ Golvin 1988, 353-354. A bone “jeton” from Meaux in France may have functioned as a theatre or amphitheatre *tessera* (AE 2004, 927). On one side is inscribed XXX *Dec(i)mus*, which may indicate that a seat, perhaps the thirtieth, was reserved in a section of the venue; this section may either have been named after an individual *Decimus* or was in fact the tenth section.

⁷² Two seats identified as numbers four and twenty-one have survived from the theatre of Volaterra (22), in the amphitheatres of Rimini and Pola only single seat numbers have been found (16.1, 23.74), and in the amphitheatre of Lyon a seat may be identified as *locus numerus I* (36.4). An inscription from Calama that may be from a theatre seat reads *locus I*, perhaps identifying the first seat in a row, but its identity is not secure (Gsell 1965, no. 319).

⁷³ 21.

including those in the amphitheatres of Aquileia, Milan, Pola, Arles, and Nîmes, and in the theatre of Pompeii were demarcated by *lineae*.⁷⁵ The standard seat width seems to have been approximately 0.40 metres; those in the theatre of Pompeii were 0.39 metres wide, those in the amphitheatre of Pola were 0.38-0.40 metres wide, and those in the amphitheatres of Arles and Nîmes 0.40 metres wide.⁷⁶ In Arles and Nîmes incisions in the form of a fern were made every two metres, corresponding exactly to five seats.⁷⁷ This grouping of seats by fives also seems to have affected their reservation, since various bodies not only in these venues but also in the amphitheatre of Lyon were assigned seats in groups of five (below). The division of seats every two metres in the amphitheatres of Arles and Nîmes is the same on the very last row of the *cavea* as it is on the second row of the podium, which might indicate that almost every spectator was allotted the same amount of space (although it is of course possible that at the rear of the audience more than five spectators were meant to fit in the two metres).⁷⁸ Decurions and other magistrates were seated on *bisellia* in the first row which would have provided them with more room. The apparent equality in seat size elsewhere in these two venues suggests that one of the factors determining the quality of a seat may not have been its size, except at the very front of the audience. Distance from the events taking place in the arena or on stage, as well as distance from

⁷⁴ A *linea* was the inscribed boundary line separating seats, as mentioned in Ovid (*Am.* 3.2.19).

⁷⁵ Seats in the theatre of Aquileia were numbered from right to left (**15.2**, **.5**); seats six, seven, nineteen, twenty, and twenty-one from unknown sections of the venue are securely identified. In a spectacular venue in Corfinium (the original location of the seat is unknown, **18**), the amphitheatre of Milan (*EAOR* II 73), the theatre of Pompeii (Formigé 1914, 32; Golvin 1988, 353), and the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum (*CIL* III 10494) seats were numbered left to right.

⁷⁶ Golvin 1988, 173.

⁷⁷ Formigé 1914, 32; Grénier 1958, 620; Golvin 1988, 188.

the individual presiding over the events, were more important.⁷⁹

The presence of a numeral on a seat did not always serve to identify it. In several cases a grouping of seats was granted to a body and the number thus assigned, often accompanied by *loca*, was indicated on the seats themselves.⁸⁰ In the amphitheatre of Arles three inscriptions assign seats in multiples of five: thirty seats on the podium were given to an unknown group, and in the *ima cavea* twenty-five seats were assigned to an unknown group and twenty seats were granted to the *scholastici* of the city.⁸¹ In the amphitheatre of Lyon twenty seats were assigned to an unknown group, and in the amphitheatre of Nîmes the *nautae* sailing upon the Ardèche and the Ouvèze rivers were granted twenty-five seats on the podium and those sailing upon the Rhône and Saône forty seats in the same area.⁸² From these examples it seems that in these venues, seats, unless assigned on an individual basis, might have been allocated by fives. This distribution by fives may be related to the actual division of seats in groups of five every two metres as is shown by the inscribed *lineae* and fern-shaped markings mentioned above. Certain groups were granted space not by a specific number of seats but instead by a number of rows. In the theatre of Mérida the local *equites* were given what may be ten rows while two inscriptions

⁷⁸ Formigé 1914, 32.

⁷⁹ Kolendo 1981, 302.

⁸⁰ A seating inscription from the theatre of Aquileia (15.1) may have been meant to assign a specific number of seats to an individual or individuals but it is too fragmentary in nature for an interpretation to be offered. A text from the amphitheatre of Speyer assigns a lost number of *loca* to an unknown group of individuals (53). A text from Urso whose original location is unknown lists the name of a woman followed by *loca III* (CIL II²/5, 1046). Although it is tempting to see this as the grant of three seats in a spectacular venue to a woman, it is virtually certain that this inscription is reserving a spot for a female in a columbarium; cf. CIL II²/5, 1049, 1053, 1058, 1059.

⁸¹ 26.3; 27.1, .6.

from the theatre of Orange each grant three rows to the *equites* of the population.⁸³

Inscriptions on seats could also reserve a specific amount of space rather than a number of seats. The amount of space is referenced by a number of *pedes* and sometimes also by a number of *semis*.⁸⁴ These texts are few in number and unless their original context is known they can be confused with fragmentary funerary inscriptions.⁸⁵ Presumably the grant of a specific amount of space occurred more rarely than the grant of a specific number of seats since the seats were easier to quantify because their divisions were already marked.⁸⁶

⁸² 36.4; 30.3, 30.4.

⁸³ 50; 29.

⁸⁴ A Roman *pes* measured 11.65 inches (296 mm) and was divided into 12 equal portions, *unciae*; half a foot was a *semis*. Several such inscriptions are found in the Colosseum (Orlandi 2004, nos. 14.1, 14.3, 14.7, 14.8, 14.15, 14.18, 14.20).

⁸⁵ For example a fragmentary inscription from the theatre of Pola whose text reads *PED* could be from a theatre seat but it could also be a fragment from a funerary epitaph that was found in the theatre (*CIL* V 299). From either the *media* or *summa cavea* of the western sector in the theatre of Cordoba comes a text granting a woman two feet of space (42.1) and an inscription from an unknown venue in Tarragona assigns a unidentified group eighteen *pedes* and a lost number of *semis* of space (47.3; Chapter 4).

⁸⁶ In Urbs Salvia the consul Lucius Flavius Nonius Bassus, his mother, and perhaps his wife provided funding for the construction of the local amphitheatre (*EAOR* III 78; a similar inscription discussing the honours given to a local individual and his mother, one of which was privileged seating in the amphitheatre (perhaps only for the son) was found at Cumae (*AE* 1927, 158; Sherk 1970, no. 41)). A portion of the inscription, most likely located on the podium of the amphitheatre, grants six hundred and fifty seats to the *plebs Urbisalviensium*. Buonocore (1992, 113) believes that the entire population of the city would have been more than six hundred and fifty individuals and therefore that this number must indicate particular representatives of the population. If so, how these individuals would have been chosen and whether the same people were granted access to these seats for each event in the amphitheatre is unclear. It is doubtful that these individuals were the adult male members of the local population since it seems unlikely that they would number precisely six hundred and fifty and there is evidence, both in and outside of Rome, against the complete exclusion of women from gladiatorial presentations (Chapter 1 and below).

Seats reserved for individuals

The majority of seating inscriptions in Italian and western venues reserve seats for individuals identified by name alone and fall into two groups: those that refer to a *locus* ("place of") and those that do not.⁸⁷ Seating inscriptions for individuals generally consist of abbreviations or are too fragmentary for the name to be determined. Inscriptions containing personal names can also present a problem in terms of the length of time during which the reservation of the seat would have been observed by other audience members. If the individual in question were to be absent, there is no way of knowing whether his or her seat would remain empty or if someone else would sit in it. If an individual were to move away or die, his or her seat must have been passed on to another spectator; either the new name was inscribed over the earlier one or the seat was occupied in a less regulated fashion.⁸⁸ It is also very difficult to determine whether a seat was reserved for an individual because of an official mandate or if instead someone took it upon himself to mark the seat in an unofficial manner. The use of the formula *datus decreto decurionum* makes this task easier since it is an indication of an official grant. This grant of a seat by a decree of the decurions represents an official assignation of public space to an audience member or members, and was therefore both recognition and confirmation of an individual's place within local society. This formula was not used very often to grant seats to individuals, and *locus* alone with the name of the individual for whom the seat was reserved is

⁸⁷ For those inscriptions that do mention a *locus*, knowledge of the original location of the text is crucial since this term was also used in funerary and honorary contexts. Several inscriptions from columbaria in Urso have already been discussed (*supra* n. 80).

found much more frequently.⁸⁹ It does not seem that the use of *locus* rather than of *datus decreto decurionum* indicates an unofficial rather than an official inscription since several such texts were located on the podia of amphitheatres, bestowing upon the individual in question the honour of one of the best seats in the venue.⁹⁰ Fewer seats off of the podium are reserved by means of *locus*, although this may be merely an accident of survival.⁹¹ Where the case of the name following *locus* can be securely identified, in every example but one the names are in the genitive. An inscription from the Chester amphitheatre in England in which a seat is reserved for a Seranus is the only example of *locus* followed by the possessive dative, Serano.⁹²

Far more common than seating inscriptions with *locus* and a personal name are those in which only the personal name survives; in some cases the *locus* which preceded the name has been lost while in others it is possible that only the name was originally inscribed. In those texts in which the names of the individuals can be deciphered, of those names whose endings survive the most common case by far is the genitive. In many inscriptions this case might originally have

⁸⁸ Kolendo 1981, 312. Many of the seats of the Paris amphitheatre show evidence of reuse (38).

⁸⁹ An amphitheatre seat from Rimini was granted by decurional decree, but whether it should be expanded as *locus* or *loca* is impossible to determine (16.2). A text from Speyer has been resolved to state that the *loca* were *data decreto decurionum civitas Nemetum* (53); whether these *loca* were assigned to individuals or to a body within the community is unclear. For the difficulties presented by seating inscriptions, see above.

⁹⁰ On the balustrade of the podium of the amphitheatre of Syracuse are nine inscriptions containing *locus* that appear to be reserving seats for individuals (12.1, .2, .4, .5, .8, .13, .14, .16, .20). A *locus* on the podium of the amphitheatre of Avaricum Biturigum is reserved for Gavia Quieta, the daughter of a local *duumvir* (33) and in the amphitheatre of Lyon a *locus* is reserved for an Anemus (37.8). On the podium of the amphitheatre of Nîmes a *locus* was reserved for an individual whose name cannot be restored (30.1).

⁹¹ A seat from the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum is identified as the *locus* of an individual whose abbreviated name is followed by his occupation, the *carcerarius legionis* (55.10), and an amphitheatre seat from Chester is identified as the *locus Serano* (51).

⁹² 51.

been preceded by *locus* but could also have stood on its own as an indication of the possession of the seat. The seating inscriptions from the theatre of Lopodunum in Germany are unusual and use a formula unique to this venue. Five seats in the theatre carried inscriptions containing names inscribed in the nominative, four of which are preceded by *vicanis Lopodunensibus* in the dative.⁹³ R. Wiegels suggests that these inscriptions represent not only the reservation of the seat for a particular individual, but also the involvement of the individual named in the financing of the theatre. That is, the seat was a symbol of a donation to the community in return for which the individual received both the privilege of the use of this reserved seat and public acknowledgement of his donation.⁹⁴

Even more problematic than the inscriptions reserving a seat for an individual only by name are those seats bearing a personal name and the title of an office.⁹⁵ While a seat inscribed with only a title could be reused by anyone who filled the position, the addition of an individual's name limited its use; future occupants would either have had to have the seat reinscribed or been forced to ignore the name already present. Inscriptions reserving seats for individuals of a particular rank or status do not pose the same problem since, unlike for an office, rank is assigned

⁹³ **52.1, .2, .3, .4.**

⁹⁴ Wiegels 2000, 190.

⁹⁵ In the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum the *carcerarius legionis*, whose name seems to have accompanied his title, was given a seat (**55.10**), in the theatre of Lopodunum a seat was reserved for an individual who may also be the *magister pagi* (**52.5**), and in the amphitheatre of Sarmizegetusa a *bisellium* was granted to an *Augustalis* whose name may also appear (**11.2**). Several inscriptions from the amphitheatre of Carthage indicating that the occupant of the seat was a *principalis almae Karthaginis* appear to contain the individual's name, although the texts are very fragmentary (**58.8b, .16, .18a, .19a, .20, .21a, 59.1**). A text from the same venue which refers to a *sacerdotalis*, a priest of the imperial cult, may also mention his name (**58.15**).

to one individual and cannot be transferred to another; these texts should be seen no differently than those containing only names. The best examples of indication of rank come from the amphitheatre of Carthage where seats were assigned to individuals identified as *virī clarissimi* as well as perhaps *clarissimi iuvenes* and *clarissimi pueri*.⁹⁶

Although the identity of the occupants of inscribed seats generally can at best only be speculated upon, an analysis of the position of these seats within the *caveae* of venues provides insight into the place of the occupant within the perceived social hierarchy of his or her community.⁹⁷ Of those seats whose original location is known, many are from the podia of amphitheatres. This is hardly surprising. The grant of a reserved seat in a spectacular venue to an individual was an indication of elevated social standing. For the grant to be considered a great honour the location of the seat would have to be most favourable, as near to the front of the audience as possible. In fact, the reservation of a seat for an individual – and the same does not always apply to offices or groups – would be most effective were the seat located at the front of the audience. There it would be in full view of the spectators present and would be among the seats of others of high status. The visibility of the individual occupying a reserved seat was one of the most important factors in determining the quality of the seat; two others were the distance of the seat from the stage or arena and the distance from the individual presiding over the

⁹⁶ 58.2, .4, .5b, .6, .7, .8a, .9, .10a, .11, .18b, 59.3; 58.5a, .13, .24b.

⁹⁷ MacMullen (1963, 101-102) makes suggestions for the identity of several individuals who were assigned seats in the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum (55.1, .5, .6, .8, .10, .12, .14, .19).

games.⁹⁸

Podium seats, as well as seats throughout the *cavea*, were reserved not only for important male members of the community but also for women, an arrangement very different from that in Rome where the majority of women were relegated to the back of the audience by the *lex Iulia theatralis*. The reason for this difference may be that the involvement of Italian and western women in sociopolitical life was greater than that of women in Rome. From the beginning of the second century C.E. municipalities seem to have become increasingly dependent upon wealthy women for benefactions.⁹⁹ In Italy and the provinces women funded the construction of public buildings, were *patronae* both of associations and of communities, were priestesses of the imperial cult, and undertook restricted *munera*.¹⁰⁰ It is from the late second century onward that the known instances of municipal *patronae* in Italy and the West date.¹⁰¹ The existence of these women must be viewed with caution and should not be taken as indicative of an increase in the official political role of women in public life in Italy and the West.

⁹⁸ Kolendo 1981, 302.

⁹⁹ Forbis 1990, 494; also Garnsey (1974) who dates the decline of benefactions by decurions to this date. He suggests (232-241) both that the pressures of liturgies had increased by this time and that although epigraphic evidence indicates that decurions were voluntarily donating more than before, only the wealthiest would have been able to do so.

¹⁰⁰ For example, in Pompeii Eumachia, a public priestess and *patrona* of the guild of fullers, dedicated a prominent building in the Forum in her name and that of her son (*ILS* 3785, 6368; see Nicols (1989, 126) on the role of women as *patronae* of *collegia*). In Tiberian Cumae a local woman and her son were honoured for their acts of beneficence in the community (*AE* 1927, 158; Sherk 1970, no. 41) and in Urbs Salvia a woman and her consular son provided for the construction of the local amphitheatre (*EAOR III* 78; *supra* n. 86). Priestesses of the imperial cult are commemorated by over two hundred inscriptions, making this priesthood the public function most attested for women in the West (Hemelrijk 2005, 138).

¹⁰¹ The earliest dates to 190 C.E. and the latest to 310 C.E. Nicols (1989) compiled a catalogue of municipal *patronae* from Italy and North Africa. The practice of adopting a *patrona* rather than a *patronus* seems to have varied from region to region (Nicols 1989, 130-132, 137).

It seems that, at least on a very limited and individual basis, Italian and provincial women could also play a role in the *Augustales*.¹⁰² This potential involvement in the *Augustales* provided women with another avenue through which they could become prominent public figures and it seems reasonable to suggest that female *Augustales* would have been subjected to *summae honorariae* and been expected to make financial contributions to their communities. It may in fact have been the increased need for funds that caused the *Augustales* in Misenum to open their doors to women.¹⁰³ It is important to note that when a woman married she took on the same social status as her husband and it was not unheard of to find a woman holding a priesthood or magistracy only because her husband originally held it.¹⁰⁴ The offices which these women held tended in fact to have very little, if any, practical and political importance and were mostly avenues by which wealthy women could participate financially in their communities.¹⁰⁵ The use of honorary inscriptions and other methods, such as the grant of privileged seating at games, of rewarding these public-minded women was an effective method of encouraging other women to do the same in a time when their wealth was in demand.¹⁰⁶

The placement of certain women at the front of Italian and western audiences is

¹⁰² An inscribed statue base from the Sacellum of the *Augustales* at Misenum reveals that a Nymphidia Monime was adlected in 149 C.E. into the *corpus* upon the death of her husband, an *Augustalis*. Not only was she a woman active in the *Augustales*, she is also the first known individual to have been co-opted by the *corpus* rather than having been chosen by the decurions. The *pronaos* of the same Sacellum was donated by Cassia Victoria, a priestess of the *Augustales*. See D'Arms (2000) and Zevi (2000) for these statue bases, and Miniero (2000) and Muscettola (2000) for the Sacellum in general.

¹⁰³ *Supra* n. 102.

¹⁰⁴ Gardner 1986, 67-68; this was the case with Nymphidia Monime (*supra* n. 102).

¹⁰⁵ Gardner 1986, 67-68.

¹⁰⁶ Forbis 1990, 506. On women and public life in Italy and the West see MacMullen (1980);

noteworthy. A Tiberian inscription from Cumae seems to grant a local individual and his mother the right to sit in a *tribunal* opposite the individual sponsoring the games (although the right may only have been given to the son); this echoes the privilege given to prominent female members of the imperial family from the time of Tiberius onwards.¹⁰⁷ The inscription in which this arrangement is mentioned is a summary of various municipal decrees passed in honour of these two individuals and it is clear that the right to sit opposite the *munerarius* was a privilege accorded as a reward for community involvement. In Avaricum Biturigum an inscription from the podium of the amphitheatre reserves a seat for the daughter of a local duumvir, and it is possible that she was given this honour because of the social status of her father. On the podium wall of the amphitheatre of Nîmes is inscribed the name *Severina*; the inscription contains no other information.¹⁰⁸ The involvement of certain women in *corpora* of the *Augustales* raises the possibility that they may have been allowed to share in the privileged seating of this group as well. The *lex de Flamonio Provinciae Narbonensis* states that the wife of the *flamen*, the high priest of the provincial imperial cult, was allowed to attend games with her husband although whether she would have shared his privileged seating is unclear.¹⁰⁹ Women were also granted reserved seats in the *cavea* at large, but overall they were assigned seats much less frequently than men.¹¹⁰ Of the three instances in which women were granted seats either on a podium or in

Nicols (1989); Forbis (1990); Navarro Caballero (2001).

¹⁰⁷ *AE* 1927, 158; Sherk 1970, no. 41. See Chapter 1.

¹⁰⁸ **33: 30.2.**

¹⁰⁹ *FIRA* 1.22; *ILS* 6964; *CIL* XII 6038.

¹¹⁰ Four seating inscriptions from the theatre of Córdoba are of female names, although their

a *tribunal*, in two the women were expressly associated with male family members. In Cumae the woman's relationship with her son was of significance and in Avaricum Biturigum it was the relationship with the father that was stressed. These particular women may only have been assigned reserved seats because the male family members to whom they were linked were of a high social standing. The placement of these women in such privileged seats, where they were in full view of all audience members, would have put them in the position of acting as public reminders of their male relatives.¹¹¹

Seats reserved for offices or groups

Texts in which the names of an office or of a body have survived are of great use in clarifying the status of these groups within their community.¹¹² The social organization of provincial *caveae* did not always reflect the exact social hierarchy of a community and could instead act as a display of an idealized – according to the local elite – societal structure. The grant of seats to an office or a group was an indication of its importance to the community as it was perceived by the local *ordo decurionum*. *Loca* on the podium of the amphitheatre of Nîmes, for example, were reserved for *nautae* identified by the name of the river upon which they sailed,

original location is unknown (42.1, .2b, .3, 43). The inscription *Mariae Salviae*, which might have been a seating inscription, was found in a wall of the theatre of Casinum (17).

¹¹¹ Imperial women frequently served as visible reminders of the power of the emperor; see Purcell (1986); Flory (1993); Boatwright (2000).

¹¹² The groups or offices for which seats were reserved in Italy and the West can be categorized in the following manner: administrative or political units, magistrates and decurions, those identified by rank or status, *Augustales*, religious offices other than *Augustales*, *collegia*, the military, peoples, and *alia*.

and their importance in the economy of Gaul is indicated by the frontal location of these seats.¹¹³

The reservation of seats for individuals or for a single office or priesthood was more effective if the seat was near the front of the venue because the individual in question could be seen by all the audience members, as discussed above, but the reservation of seats for a larger group did not necessarily need to follow the same principle. The demarcation of a large area of public space for a group within a theatre or amphitheatre would have had a visual impact merely because of the number of individuals who were seated together, and therefore the location of seats for a group was not as important for visibility to other audience members as it was for an individual. This is not to say, however, that the grant of seats on the podium or in the orchestra for a group of individuals was not a greater honour than the grant of seats elsewhere in the venue.

As in Rome, senators and equestrians were granted reserved seats in Italian and western venues and the *senatus consultum* passed under Augustus ensured that senators had seats in the first row. The majority of the western inscriptions for senators come from the amphitheatre of Carthage where many seats were reserved for *viri clarissimi*, presumably on the podium.¹¹⁴ *Clarissimi pueri* and *clarissimi iuvenes* may also have had their own seats in the same venue.¹¹⁵ Provincial equestrians do not appear to always have been assigned fourteen rows as they were the *equites* in Rome, in Republican Gades on at least one occasion, and according to Petronius, also

¹¹³ 30.3, .4; Kolendo 1981, 311.

¹¹⁴ 58.2, .4, .5b, .6, .7, .8a, .9, .10a, .11, .18b; 59.3.

¹¹⁵ 58.5a, .13, .24b.

in Campania.¹¹⁶ In the theatre of Mérida equestrians may have been granted ten rows, while in the theatre of Orange they were assigned three rows, and in the amphitheatre of Syracuse an individual who was an *eques Romanus* had his own seat on the podium.¹¹⁷ All the epigraphic evidence for *equites* from the provinces comes from near the front of the *cavea*, but none of it confirms that provincial *equites* were granted fourteen rows as the *lex Roscia theatralis* had assigned them in Rome.¹¹⁸

It has in fact been questioned whether the *equites* for whom seats were reserved in the West were even the same as those for whom seats were reserved in Rome. J.-C. Golvin suggests that the *equites* with seats in the *cavea* of the theatres of Orange and Mérida were of a different type than the *equites* who had the right to the fourteen rows in Rome. He states that it was the *equites equo publico* who were given privileged seating in Rome, and that whenever these individuals travelled outside the city they would sit in the orchestra with the decurions and senators. The *equites* found in the *caveae* of provincial venues were, according to Golvin, *equites romani a plebe*, who were part of the *plebs* of whom they were merely leading citizens

¹¹⁶ Cic. *ad Fam.* 10.32.2; Petr. *Sat.* 126. In the *Satyricon*, Circe's maid Chrysis mentions that her mistress prefers to pass over the fourteen rows and look for a lover from the back of the theatre.

¹¹⁷ 50, 29, 12.1+2. There are two ways in which the equestrian rows in Orange might have been assigned. The *equites* may have been given the first three rows of each of the two *cunei* in which the texts were found, providing approximately one hundred and seventy seats (Kolendo 1981, 310). Alternatively, the inscriptions can be interpreted as reserving the first three rows of the entire theatre, providing the *equites* with approximately three hundred and forty seats (Formigé 1914, 47-49). Strabo relates that by 43 B.C.E. the total number of five hundred men of equestrian rank in Gades was not equalled in any other city at that time except Patavium, although of course the number of provincial *equites* would have increased under the empire (Strabo 3.5.3; cf. Cic. *ad Fam.* 10.32.2).

¹¹⁸ See Chapter 1. An inscription from Herculaneum relates the many honours given to the equestrian Marcus Nonius Balbus, patron of the city, one of which is the placement of a *sella curulis* in the

without any true political function.¹¹⁹ There is not in fact any evidence that it was only the *equites equo publico* who could sit in the fourteen rows in Rome, nor that the individuals who had this seating in Rome were of a different status than those *equites* who had reserved areas in provincial *caveae*.

Decurions were given privileged seating along with the senators and equestrians. The Caesarian *lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* reveals that they had their own reserved area in the orchestra at theatrical spectacles and presumably at the very front of the audience at *munera*.¹²⁰ Unfortunately few secure seating inscriptions survive for decurions, although those that do indicate that they were seated at the front of the venue.¹²¹ Certain magistrates would have been seated at the front of the venue with the decurions or perhaps in a *tribunal*.¹²² The level of social and juridical status that was required by involvement in politics, whether on a local scale as an individual magistrate or on a larger scale as a member of the *ordo equester* or *ordo senatorius*, was reflected by the grant of reserved seats in a spectacular venue at or near to the front of the

theatre during the presentation of *ludi* (Sherk 1970, no. 28).

¹¹⁹ Golvin 1988, 347-348 as per Formigé (1914, 48). See Chapter 1 for the seating of the *equites* in Rome and for the difficulty of determining to whom exactly the seats were granted.

¹²⁰ Chapters 125 and 127; see above.

¹²¹ An inscription from a *bisellium* which would originally have been located on the podium of the amphitheatre of Sarmizegetusa may be reserved for a local decurion (10.10), and a text from the amphitheatre of Mérida reserves a podium seat for a decurion as well (49.1).

¹²² The *quattuorviri* of Carnuntum were assigned very good seats in the military amphitheatre in the *tribunal* opposite that of the legate of the legion. It is possible that these civilian magistrates were granted a reserved area in the military venue that echoed their seats in the civilian venue as a gesture of goodwill by the military settlement (56; Kolendo 1981, 312). For more on the provision of seats for civilians in military venues see Chapter 4.

audience.¹²³

A group of individuals who were near in social status to the decurions of their community but who did not have the same juridical status were the *Augustales*. In towns in Italy and the West rich *liberti* often owned as much land as the local decurions.¹²⁴ Although they could not become decurions because of their servile origin they were sometimes rewarded instead with the *ornamenta decurionalia*.¹²⁵ From Augustus onward wealthy freedmen formed their own body called the *Augustales*, the *corpus* of which comprised largely, from eighty-five to ninety-five percent, *liberti* although *ingenui* and it seems perhaps even women (very rarely) could be members as well.¹²⁶ The *Augustales* were originally a priestly grouping responsible for maintaining the imperial cult but became to a large extent more of an *ordo* second to the decurions in status. In effect, they were an official middle in both the economic and social spheres of towns in Italy and the West. Their magisterial functions were extended under Trajan when they were organized into *corpora*, *collegia*, or *ordines*; as a result more emphasis was placed upon these functions than their roles as priests.¹²⁷ The *Augustales*, like members of the

¹²³ A *praefectus* may have had his own seat in the amphitheatre of Italica but the inscription is too fragmentary for a restoration to be made with certainty (45.7). In the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum a *vilicus* may have had a reserved seat, although the restoration is uncertain and its original location is unknown (55.4); it has been suggested that he was the *vilicus* of the *statio vectigalis* (Kolendo 1979, 47). The *principales almae Karthaginis*, leading dignitaries of Carthage in the late fourth and fifth centuries, were given their own seats in the amphitheatre (58.8b, .16, .18a, .19a, .20, .21a, 59.1; Kotula 1968, esp. 243). In the same venue a *devotus agens in rebus*, a courier between the central government and the province, may have had his own seat (58.14a).

¹²⁴ Alföldy 1985, 131.

¹²⁵ *CIL* II²/7 139, for example. For the *ornamenta* of Roman *ordines* see Kleijwegt (1992).

¹²⁶ Ostrow (1990, 364); for women as *Augustales* *supra* n. 102.

¹²⁷ Taylor 1914, 242-244; D'Arms 1981, 27. An inscription from Suessa Aurunca, for example,

ordo decurionum, paid a *summa honoraria* and made cash donations to their towns both collectively and individually and were granted status symbols including insignia and privileged seating at games and theatrical presentations.¹²⁸ They were often named after the decurions in lists of who was to receive or donate funds, both stressing their importance in the community and reinforcing their secondary status.¹²⁹ The *Augustales* in some respects resemble the *equites* at Rome in that they were the second of three subsections of Italian and western communities – the decurions, the *Augustales*, and the *plebs* – just as the equestrians were the middle layer in Rome between the *senatus* and the *populus*.¹³⁰ The creation of the *Augustales* under Augustus allowed Italian and Western *liberti*, denied membership in the local decurional order, to be officially invested with social status. Augustus' motivation can be seen not as encouraging worship of his person, which he did not allow in Rome or in Italy, but rather as defining a function within the state for these *liberti* as he had done with the senators, *equites*, and imperial *liberti* and slaves.¹³¹

Although the *Augustales* were of a similar social status to the decurions, their juridical status was not comparable because the majority of the *Augustales* were *liberti*. This conflict

reveals that a decree was passed by the *ordo decurionum et Augustalium et plebs universa* (CIL X 4760).

¹²⁸ For example CIL X 1217, 1881, 4760.

¹²⁹ CIL II 4511; IX 23; X 112, 415, 1881; AE 1927, 124.

¹³⁰ CIL X 4760, 6677 for example; see Taylor (1914, 243) who dates this tripartite division of provincial communities to the time of Trajan. Ostrow (1990, 370-371), citing evidence from Ostia, sees the *Augustales* as serving the same function for the local decurions as the *equites* did for the senators in Rome in that their descendants were able to become members of the upper *ordo*.

¹³¹ Dio Cass. 51.20.8. Ostrow (1990, 366-367) stresses that although Augustus might not have been actively involved in the initial creation of the *Augustales*, his permission would have been required for them to become integrally involved with the imperial cult. He suggests (367) that the creation of the *Augustales* was a "piece-meal, step-by-step evolution responding as much to local developments in the towns as to events in Rome." For more on *Augustales* see for example Taylor (1914); Tudor (1962); Duthoy (1970); Ostrow (1985); Šašel Kos (1999); D'Arms (2000); Miniero (2000). See Chapter 1 for Augustus' role in

between juridical and social status did not, however, prevent the *Augustales* from being granted reserved seats in theatrical or amphitheatrical audiences, in some cases on par with or at least near to that of the decurions. Many honorary inscriptions for *Augustales* make reference to the grant of a *bisellium*, suggesting that the individual in question was seated at the front of the venue.¹³² It is possible, although the evidence is scanty, that the direct involvement of a venue with the celebrations for the provincial imperial cult might have had an effect upon the seating of *Augustales*. Of the three venues, all amphitheatres, in which seating inscriptions for *Augustales* have been found, two were associated with the provincial imperial cult. *Augustales* might have had seats on the podium of the amphitheatre of Lyon, the venue in which celebrations were held for the annual meetings of the *Tres Galliae*.¹³³ They also might have had privileged seating on *bisellia* in the amphitheatre of Sarmizegetusa, a venue located just to the west of the provincial imperial cult complex and in which the celebrations for the annual meeting of the *concilium* of the *Tres Daciae* were held.¹³⁴ In Carnuntum, on the other hand, the *Augustales municipi Aelii*

defining the *ordo senatorius* and the *ordo equester*; also Ostrow (1990, 368-372).

¹³² A fragmentary inscription from Epora grants a local *sevir Augustalis* the *ornamenta decurionalia* as well as the right to be seated among the decurions at public meals. It is possible that the missing portion of the inscription following these grants refers to seating at games; suggested restorations are *inter decuriones ludis convenire permisit* and *inter decuriones ludis insertis* although neither can be confirmed (Stylov *ad CIL* II²/7, 139). In Veii the freedman Caius Iulius Gelotus was granted the right to attend public meals among the *centumviri* and also to be seated on a *bisellium* among the *Augustales* at all local spectacles (*CIL* XI 3805). Several honorary inscriptions refer to a *bisellium* for an *Augustalis* without making reference to in what venue it should be used: *CIL* V 7618; IX 2249, 2475, 3524; X 14, 1026, 1030, 1217. The *ordo decurionum et Augustalium et plebs universa* of Suessa Aurunca decreed the *honor biselli* to a local *Augustalis* because he provided a gladiatorial show; his son was allowed into the *ordo decurionum* without having to pay a *summa honoraria* because of his father's standing in the community (*CIL* X 4760; Kleijwegt 1992, 132).

¹³³ 37.1, .2.

¹³⁴ 10.3, 11.2; Étienne et al. 1990a, 279-280 and fig.2; 1990b, 93-94 and fig. 2. For more on the

Karnuntini did not have seats at the front of the audience, but rather in the second *maenianum*.¹³⁵

Carnuntum was not the centre of the provincial cult in *Pannonia Inferior*, a role which was instead filled by the town of Savaria.¹³⁶ Unfortunately solid evidence for the seating of *Augustales* in other venues is lacking and therefore this suggested connection with the provincial imperial cult cannot be confirmed. The high priest of the imperial cult was allowed to wear a magistrate's toga at all games throughout the province and to watch the events from seats among the decurions or senators.¹³⁷ The high priest was not, however, an *Augustalis* but instead a member of the wealthy local elite or sometimes even an equestrian.¹³⁸

In general the *caveae* of Italian and western venues were divided among various political, occupational, and religious groupings, as well containing reserved seats for individuals and seats for the population in general. It is only in Roman North Africa that there is evidence for the organization of spectators according to membership in a voting tribe, or *curia*. The term *curia* originally referred to a division of the Roman people into thirty groups that appear to have been

association of spectacular venues with the imperial cult see Chapter 4.

¹³⁵ **57.1**; the inscription reserving *loca* for the *Augustales municipi Aelii Karnuntini* is found in a *vomitrium* which leads to seats in the second *maenianum*. In the amphitheatre of Tarragona *seviri* were given their own seats but the original location of the inscription is unknown (**48.2**). For a detailed discussion of the offices of *Augustalis*, *sevir Augustalis*, and *sevir* see Taylor (1914, 1924) and Nock (1934); also Šašel Kos (1999).

¹³⁶ Fishwick 1987, vol. 1.2, 303.

¹³⁷ As stated by the the Vespasianic *lex de Flamonio Provinciae Galliae Narbonensis* (FIR 1.22; ILS 6964; CIL XII 6038); Levick (2000, no. 126); Fishwick (2002, vol. 3.2, 3-15).

¹³⁸ Étienne et al. 1990a, 277-278; Fishwick 2002, vol 3.2, 11, 296, 298-300. In Carthage a high priest, a *sacerdotalis*, had a seat in an unknown area of the amphitheatre (**58.15**). Although in the amphitheatre of Sarmizegetusa, closely associated with the provincial imperial cult, a *flamen* had his own *bisellium* at the front of the audience (**10.9**), the term used in Dacia for the high priest appears to have been *sacerdos*. The title *sacerdos* was originally used where worship was given to Roma and the living emperor, whereas *flamen* was used where the focus of worship was a *divus* or *divi*, that is, deceased rulers who were

the basic unit not only of assemblies of the people but also of the army.¹³⁹ *Curiae* are also attested much later in Italy and the provinces, and especially in Roman North Africa, in their capacity as voting units of local assemblies.¹⁴⁰ There is evidence for seating according to *curia* in the amphitheatre of Lambaesis and in the theatre of Lepcis Magna.¹⁴¹ In the amphitheatre of Lambaesis the names of six *curiae* (*Antoniniana*, *Augusta*, *Aurelia*, *Papiria*, *Saturnia*, and *Traiana*) were inscribed on various rows in the upper section of the *cavea*.¹⁴² The inscriptions appear to assign one row in more than one *cuneus* to the members of each *curia*. Since these texts survive from only four *cunei* it is difficult to determine the precise arrangements, but the names may have been inscribed both at the midpoint of the assigned seats and at either end in order to mark off the relevant amount of space.¹⁴³ Although no seating inscriptions for *curiae* are found in any other venues, statue bases surviving in the theatre of Lepcis Magna provide evidence for curial seating. These statues were erected in the theatre by various *curiae* in honour of Septimius Severus and members of his family and they would have originally stood in the sections of the theatre in which the members of the relevant group were seated.¹⁴⁴ While the division of the audience according to *curiae* is at first glance more in keeping with the tribal

given the status of state god (Fishwick 2002, vol. 3.2, 294-295).

¹³⁹ Alföldy 1985, 6.

¹⁴⁰ For more on *curiae* in Roman North Africa see Kotula (1968); Gascou (1976).

¹⁴¹ See Torelli (1971).

¹⁴² 64.

¹⁴³ Kolendo 1981, 308-309.

¹⁴⁴ *IRT* 391, 405, 406, 411, 413, 414, 416, 417, 420, 436, 541; Torelli (1971); Kolendo (1981, 309). It is not clear, however, what the precise seating arrangements were.

seating of the East, these groups were in effect closer to *collegia* in their organization.¹⁴⁵ The *curiae* served the same religious purpose as did the *Augustales*, who are rarely attested in North Africa; they were responsible for the maintenance of the municipal imperial cult.¹⁴⁶

In some of the venues in Italy and the West reserved seats were granted according to occupational affiliation. Membership in a *collegium* was in fact one of the only ways in which individuals of a lower rung on the social hierarchy could obtain their own seat in a spectacular venue.¹⁴⁷ The grant of seats to *collegia* should be seen more as a reflection of the importance of their financial contribution to the local economy than a reflection of their social status, since *collegia* comprised working individuals.¹⁴⁸ The *nautae* in Nîmes were granted reserved seats on the podium of the local amphitheatre whose extent was indicated by two identical inscriptions.¹⁴⁹ The centre of activity of these *nautae* was not Nîmes and the reservation of seats for these individuals on the podium of the amphitheatre stresses their importance in the economy of the city.¹⁵⁰ Oil merchants may have been given seats on the podium of the amphitheatre of Arles,

¹⁴⁵ Kotula 1968, 51.

¹⁴⁶ Kotula 1968, 72-75, 88; Whittaker 1997, 150-151.

¹⁴⁷ Kolendo 1981, 315; see Chapter 4 for the importance of group membership in obtaining reserved seats. Following van Nijf (1997, 9) this study refers to private associations as *collegia*, but this is not meant to suggest that these different groups were identical in nature.

¹⁴⁸ Futrell 2000, 165. The number of *collegia* for whom seats were reserved is greater in the East than in Italy and the West; see Chapter 3.

¹⁴⁹ **30.3, .4**; Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 63. A very fragmentary inscription may indicate that the *nautae* had seats in an unknown area in the amphitheatre of Paris (**38.15**), and a *navicularius* or perhaps *nautae* may have had an area in the *ima cavea* of the amphitheatre of Nîmes, but again the text is very fragmentary (**31.5**). *Navicularii* could be free or freed individuals. The best-known example of a freedman acting as a *navicularius* is Petronius' Trimalchio; also *ILS* 7029 for a Roman freedman who was a *navicularius* and also served as a *sevir augustalis* in Lyon and Puteoli. See Virioux (2004) for the *navicularii* of Arles and Pleket (1983, 137) for *naukleroi* in the East.

¹⁵⁰ The Rhône enters from the Mediterranean at Arles, to the east of Nîmes, and the confluence of

perhaps because of an official relationship with the emperor concerning the *annona*.¹⁵¹ Reserved seats for other *collegia*, including priestly organizations, were located throughout the *cavea*.¹⁵² Another occupational group mentioned in a seating inscription from the amphitheatre of Syracuse is that of the *tabularii*, for whose members either a single seat or a group of seats was reserved on the podium.¹⁵³ These individuals were imperial finance clerks who were largely slaves or freedmen and the reservation of seats for them on the podium, a practice very different from that in Rome, is noteworthy. Another group whose members could also be *liberti* and who were granted their own area were the *arcarii vicesimae* in the amphitheatre of Tarragona. These individuals, imperial financial clerks responsible for taxes, were seated in an unknown location.¹⁵⁴

The grant of seats to a group was not always only a reflection of its importance, whether social or financial, to the community or Roman state, since the organization of seats for a group within a single area was also advantageous in terms of crowd control (although it could of course cause problems in and of itself). The commotion caused by a large group of people seated

the Rhône and the Saône is located near Lyon (at the altar of the *Tres Galliae*). The Ardèche is a small tributary of the Rhône to the north of Orange and the Ouvèze flows into the Rhône north of Avignon; both rivers are therefore north of Nîmes. For more on maritime commerce in Gaul in the area of Arles, see Christol (1971, 1982); also Strabo (IV.I.14). For the *navicularii* of Arles see for example *CIL* III 14165, in which it appears that the five *corpora* of *navicularii* of the city threatened to go on strike.

¹⁵¹ 26.1; Haley 2003, 88-89.

¹⁵² In the amphitheatre of Arles *scholastici* were granted seats in the *ima cavea* (27.6) and the *pastophori* of the local temple of Isis were assigned seats as a group in the *media cavea* (27.4, .5). It is possible that a group of *macellarii* had reserved seats in an unknown area of the amphitheatre of Lyon (36.8), but the inscription is very fragmentary and its restoration uncertain; *infra* n. 171.

¹⁵³ 12.7; for the status of the *tabularii* see Jones (1949, 43, 47).

¹⁵⁴ 48.1; Jones 1949, 43. *Arcarii* of private individuals were usually slaves (Andreau 1999, 64-65).

together was easier to spot and subdue than that of individuals spread throughout the audience, and the Roman government kept close watch on the behaviour of *collegia* in particular since it believed that their activities might be subversive.¹⁵⁵ This did not only apply to occupational organizations. Groups of young men were also prone to disruptive acts, particularly when it came to acting as partisans of a colour, gladiator, or actor.¹⁵⁶ Although the grant of seats to *iuvenes* and perhaps *iuniores* was meant in part to recognize their status in the community, it would also have helped to contain any inappropriate behaviour they might demonstrate at the spectacles.¹⁵⁷

An occupational category whose members did not belong to a *collegium* but to whom seats were provided at spectacles was the military. Military settlements generally had their own amphitheatre, and although their precise purpose is debated it is clear that the majority of the

¹⁵⁵ Among many examples, as a result of the riot in the amphitheatre between the Pompeians and Nucerians, the Pompeian people were forbidden from forming any *collegia* for ten years (Tac. *Ann.* 14.17), and the bread-bakers of Ephesus were strongly rebuked after a strike (*IK* 11.2, 215). The punishments for the behaviour of the bakers included a ban on group meetings; if anyone was caught contradicting the edict they were liable to arrest. Also in Ephesus silver-smiths who wished to protest the teachings of Paul the apostle protested in the theatre (*Act. Ap.* 19.23-41; Roueché 1984, 181). The dislike of the central government for such associations is clear in Trajan's edict to Pliny that they should be disbanded because they posed the threat of political disturbance (Plin. *Ep.* 10.34.1, 10.96.7).

¹⁵⁶ See Chapter 3. A unique seating inscription is found in the first *maenianum* of the amphitheatre of Nîmes: *cuneus ovalis loca* (31.1). The adjective *ovalis* is very rare, and comes from *ovo*, to raise a joyful clamour, to rejoice, or to exult (*clamorem quendam laetum tollere, triumphare*). This *cuneus* could perhaps be reserved for members of a clique, but its precise nature is unclear; for the political function of cliques in the later empire see Browning (1952, 16-20).

¹⁵⁷ Cameron 1976, 77. Reserved seats for *iuniores* are found in the amphitheatre of Italica (45.10) and for *iuvenes* in the amphitheatre of Trier (54.1), although the location of these areas in the *caveae* is not known. For the seating of young men in Rome see Chapter 1; for the importance of young men to eastern communities see Chapters 3 and 4.

audience in these venues would have consisted of military personnel.¹⁵⁸ In specific instances members of the military obtained reserved seats in a venue other than that of the camp. An inscription from the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum reveals that the *carcerarius legionis* of the nearby military settlement was given his own seat in the audience. He might have received his seat because he helped supply condemned individuals and prisoners to fight in *munera* presented for the enjoyment of the civilian population.¹⁵⁹ A fragmentary inscription from the same venue appears to be reserving seats for veterans, although whether for one or for two is unclear.¹⁶⁰ The presence of these military personnel in a civilian venue reflects the reality of Aquincum, where the military and civilian settlements were adjacent, as they were in Carnuntum as well. Veterans may also have been granted seats in another venue outside of the martial context. A very fragmentary inscription from Hispalis may refer to a seating area for *veterani*.¹⁶¹ These *veterani* seem to be the new settlers of Hispalis rather than merely a military contingent of the local population. In Valentia both *veteres* and *veterani* are mentioned in inscriptions, evidence for a type of double community. The *veteres* from Valentia seem to be the old settlers of the Republican colony, whereas the *veterani* come from the resettlement of the late first

¹⁵⁸ For more on the purpose of military amphitheatres see Chapter 4.

¹⁵⁹ **55.10:** Kolendo 1979, 52 n. 89; 1981, 314. For more on the seating of military personnel in civilian amphitheatres see Chapter 4.

¹⁶⁰ **55.11.** The inscription reads *VETR II*. It is possible what appears to be the Roman numeral II is in fact be another letter that has worn away, such as part of *veterani* or part of a name. Another inscription from the same venue may be reserving a seat for a *veteranus*, although the text could also be restored to a name such as *Vettius* (**55.14**). Since the civilian settlement of Aquincum is located adjacent to the military community it is tempting to see this second text as referring to a veteran but caution must be used.

¹⁶¹ Corzo Sánchez 1994a, 243. The condition of this inscription – both sides are lost – necessitates the use of caution in its restoration.

century B.C.E. and first century C.E., and a similar situation is likely for Hispalis.¹⁶²

The larger size of many Italian and western venues relative to the size of the local population meant that attendance at spectacles was not restricted to members of the town or city itself and the reservation of seats for outsiders was possible.¹⁶³ These outsiders for whom seats were reserved could include visiting senators and possibly equestrians, as well as envoys from nearby communities, as was the case in the amphitheatre of Nîmes where representatives from Arles were given seats in the *ima cavea*.¹⁶⁴ The inhabitants of the territory around a community might often travel into town to attend spectacles as well. The Republican *lex Coloniae Genetivae* provides for the seating of outsiders as *adventores* and *hospites*, and in the civilian amphitheatre of Carnuntum the inhabitants of the *pagus Aelianus*, a subdivision of the territory of the settlement, were given their own reserved area in the first *maenianum* of the civilian amphitheatre.¹⁶⁵ The organization of the audience in such a way that outsiders were immediately recognizable, might, if the group of outsiders were large, have had negative results. It is easy to imagine that the conflict between the Pompeians and Nucerians in the amphitheatre of Pompeii escalated because the Nucerians were a distinguishable group seated together.¹⁶⁶

The presence of representatives of other towns in the audience in the case of the

¹⁶² Galsterer 1971, 53-54. For a full discussion of *veteres* and *veterani* see Galsterer (1971, 53-55).

¹⁶³ Futrell 2000, 164.

¹⁶⁴ **31.4.**

¹⁶⁵ *Lex Ursonensis*: Chapter 126; see above. Carnuntum: **57.2**; the inscription was found within a *vomitorium* that opens onto the first *maenianum*. These individuals were given seats closer to the events occurring in the arena than were the local *Augustales*.

¹⁶⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 14.17.

amphitheatre of Lyon has different implications. The spectators in the amphitheatre of Lyon in fact for a long time consisted only of envoys from other towns. This amphitheatre was part of the complex for the provincial imperial cult at the confluence of the Rhône and Saône rivers and was used for festivities during the annual meetings of the *concilium* of the *Tres Galliae*, comprising peoples from Lugdunensis, Aquitania, and Belgica.¹⁶⁷ Seating inscriptions in the amphitheatre reserve areas for the delegates of several of the peoples who made up the *Tres Galliae* and attended the annual meeting. The *Arverni*, the *Bituriges Cubi*, the *Tricasses*, and the *Vellavi* all have their own areas.¹⁶⁸ At some point the venue was opened up to individuals from outside of the *Tres Galliae* as well as perhaps to the inhabitants of Lyon.¹⁶⁹ Representatives of the *Glanici* from *Gallia Narbonensis* were granted seats and the *Antipolitani*, also from the same region, may have been given a reserved area but the inscription is fragmentary.¹⁷⁰ It is possible that after the venue was opened up only those peoples within *Gallia* as a whole were allowed to attend the games at Lyon.¹⁷¹ A similar arrangement may have been in place in Tarragona where, in an unknown venue of the city, envoys from the *concilium provinciae* of *Hispania Citerior* were granted seats. The city was the capital of the province of *Tarraconensis* and the centre of the

¹⁶⁷ This amphitheatre and its role in the provincial imperial cult is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.

¹⁶⁸ **36.1, .2, .3; 37.6.** A fragmentary inscription from this venue may be restored to provide seats for the *Aedui*, the *Viromandui*, or the *Viducassii* (**37.7**), and another may be restored as *tres provinciae Galliae*, although the identity of the individual or group who would have been seated in this spot is unknown (**37.3**).

¹⁶⁹ See Chapter 4.

¹⁷⁰ **36.6, .7.**

¹⁷¹ A text from this amphitheatre restored both as *Macedonum* and as *macellariorum* (**36.8**) has been used to suggest that envoys from the *Macedones* would have participated in the festivities and therefore that peoples from outside of all the *Galliae* could attend. This seems unlikely and it is perhaps

provincial imperial cult and these reserved seats may have been used during the annual meetings.¹⁷²

The Application of the *lex Iulia theatralis* in Italy and the West

The *lex Iulia theatralis* in its entirety could not be applied directly to Italian, western, and African cities because of the different civic and social structures of these communities. Seating arrangements in these areas were therefore not a carbon copy of those in the capital but were in some ways very similar. As the upper *ordo* of each community, decurions were given seats at the front of the venue as were senators in Rome, and the *senatus consultum* passed under Augustus provided visiting senators with seats at the front as well. *Equites* had privileged seating for which there is epigraphic evidence in Mérida, Orange, and Syracuse but the number of rows does not correspond to the fourteen given to the equestrians in Rome by the *lex Roscia theatralis*. The magistrate presiding over the spectacle was seated in a tribunal, as he was in Rome, and any person whom the community wished to honour could be given seats opposite the *munerarius* as was done for example in Cumae.¹⁷³ In Rome, Augustus gave the honour of seating in the *tribunal* opposite that of the sponsor of the games to the Vestal Virgins in recognition of their important religious role and elevated status. Along with the unofficial attendance at local spectacles of individuals from other communities, areas could be officially reserved as occurred in the amphitheatre of Nîmes where envoys from Arles had their own seats. In the Flavian

better to favour the restoration of *macellariorum* or another alternative altogether; *supra* n. 152.

¹⁷² 47.1, .2; for more on this see Chapter 4.

¹⁷³ *AE* 1927, 158; Sherk 1970, no. 41.

amphitheatre in Rome delegates from Gades had their own reserved seats and an inscription records an area for public *hospites*.¹⁷⁴ Augustus assigned the *praetextati* of Rome their own *cuneus* and seated their paedagogues in the one adjacent in order to both emphasize the importance of the young men and to make sure that their behaviour was controlled; in venues in the West it was the *iuvenes* who were instead the relevant age group granted seats. Augustus separated the soldiers from the people, and some individual veterans in the western provinces may have had their own seats in civilian venues.

It is clear that in other aspects of Italian and western seating the intention behind the *lex Iulia theatralis*, not only to arrange audience members according to their sociopolitical involvement but also to present a particular societal display that had been structured according to the desires of the leaders of each community, was applied to those institutions that did not exist in Rome or for which there were no equivalents. The *Augustales*, the *ordo* second to that of the decurions in Italy and the West, were given their own reserved seats that could be at the front of the audience; in a sense they were the provincial equivalent to the *equites* at Rome. In contrast to the arrangements in the capital, where Augustus prevented freedmen from obtaining privileged seating, in Italy and the West these individuals were able to do so through such avenues as the *Augustales* or *collegia*. In certain venues *collegia* were provided with reserved areas and membership in a professional association was a way in which a working individual could obtain his own seat. The grant of seats to these groups was based on their importance to their

¹⁷⁴ Orlandi 2004 nos. 14.5, 14.5.1, 14.11; Chapter 1.

community and the state, determined by financial contributions to the local economy rather than by their social and juridical status; in contrast, Augustus considered juridical status in particular when determining in what manner he wished to display Roman society. In Aquincum and Carnuntum, two communities which had both military and civilian amphitheatres, a social hierarchy was maintained that allowed room for individuals from the other settlement, reflecting the geographic co-existence of these double communities. The *quattuorviri* of Carnuntum were given seats in the military amphitheatre of equal privilege to those of the military legate presiding over the events, and in the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum the military *carcerarius legionis* was honoured with the grant of a seat.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the application of the *lex Iulia theatralis* in Italy and the West is its provision concerning the seating of women. While the privileged seating of women outside of Rome is in direct violation of the *lex* as it was applied in the capital, it does not seem to violate its intention. One of the reasons why Augustus relegated most women to the back of the audience might have been that he wished to emphasize that they had little official role within the new sociopolitical framework of the city. Women in Italian and western communities had a more varied involvement in public life than they did in the capital, and these women were given honours including the grant of reserved seats in the theatre and amphitheatre. They were being seated according to their sociopolitical involvement, as the *lex Iulia theatralis* directed, as well as according to their financial contributions to their communities. One of the reasons that these women might have been honoured in such a fashion was the social status of their male

family members, both husbands and fathers.

An element of audience organization in the West which is unique to the Latin-speaking cities of Roman Africa is the assignation of reserved seats to the civic *curiae*, voting units of the local population. The only venue in which seating inscriptions were found for *curiae* is the amphitheatre of Lambaesis, but there is evidence for such arrangements in the theatre of Lepcis Magna as well.

While there are many differences between the bodies and individuals honoured with reserved seats in Italy and the western provinces and those honoured in Rome, the motivation behind the organization of spectators was largely the same. Although certain aspects of the *lex Iulia theatralis* were to serve as a model for communities outside of Rome and senators were guaranteed privileged seating throughout the empire, each town was to a large degree able to organize local audiences as it saw fit. An important element of these arrangements was sociopolitical involvement, but certain other factors such as financial contributions and the social status of family members were also taken into consideration. Since each community had a certain level of independence in terms of audience organization and could structure the *cavea* to present a specific and idealized hierarchy, there was local variation in spectator arrangements. These local variations also reflected, although perhaps not as strongly as in the East, the disparate social structures of each community. In communities in the East, discussed in the following Chapter, audience organization was one of the ways in which the local elite could negotiate Roman dominance by reinforcing their community's identity to the local population.

Chapter 3: The Greek Provinces

Pre-Roman seating

Some areas of the East had a history of audience organization upon which they could rely, and this tradition continued into the Roman era. In classical Athens audience organization in the theatre of Dionysus served the same function as it later did under the Romans, to display a particular reflection of society that was considered appropriate and desirable by those in charge.¹ In Athens the arrangement of the spectators reflected the male-dominated, democratic ideology of the *polis*; seats at the front of the audience were reserved for magistrates and the rest of the citizens appear to have been seated by tribe. It seems that anyone could sit in the front rows other than in specifically reserved seats, but an individual with *prohedria* was allowed to ask them to leave.² Permanent sections at the front of the *cavea* were reserved for members of the council, ephebes, the archons, the *nomophylakes*, *strategoi*, and priests.³ Members of the council were assigned seating in an area called the *bouleutikos*, and the ephebes in the *ephebikos*, both of which were located in the central *cuneus*.⁴ Philochorus states that the *nomophylakes*, the guardians of the law, sat opposite the archons suggesting that each group was seated at or near

¹ Csapo and Slater (1995, 286-305) provide a detailed discussion of the audience in the Athenian theatre in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E.

² Scholion to Ar. *Eq.* 573-577. Before the *cavea* was built entirely out of stone only the rows for *prohedria* were in marble while all the other seats were wooden benches (scholion to Ar. *Thesm.* 395; Cratinus, Kassel-Austin, *PCG* F 360).

³ For the sake of consistency the Latin terms for theatrical and amphitheatrical architecture have been used throughout.

⁴ Ar. *Av.* 793-796; scholion to Ar. *Av.* 794; *Pax* 897-908.

either end of the *cavea*, the only areas available directly opposite one another.⁵ Although the precise location of the seats for priests and generals is unknown, Aristophanes confirms that they had *prohedria*.⁶ Xenophon suggests that foreign merchants and ship-owners should be given reserved seats at the front of the *cavea* although his proposal does not seem to have met with approval since there is no evidence of such an area.⁷

The presence of women in the Athenian audience is the subject of great debate, but ancient authors seem to imply that they did attend.⁸ Plato, for example, mentions women in the theatrical audience without providing any conclusive evidence as to their location.⁹ A passage from Aristophanes' *Pax* can be used to argue both for and against the presence of women.¹⁰ During the preparation for a mock sacrifice in the play, barley is thrown to the audience from the stage. After the slave announces that he has finished throwing the barley and that not a man in the audience does not have any (barley is also slang for penis), another character responds that the women did not receive any. This can be taken both to suggest that women were not present at all, or rather that they were present but were seated at the back of the venue and thus were too far away to catch any barley. Two sources may be used for clarification. The first, a scholion to Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*, refers to legislation introduced by the politician Phyromachus in

⁵ *FGrH* 328 F 64b.

⁶ *Ar. Ran.* 297; *Eq.* 573-577, 702-704; scholion to *Ar. Eq.* 573-577.

⁷ *Xen. Ways and Means* 3.4.

⁸ See Haigh (1889, 297-302); Wilson (1982, 158-159); Pickard-Cambridge (1968, 264-265, 269); Podlecki (1990); Henderson (1991); Goldhill (1994); Katz (1998) for the various arguments in favour of and against their presence.

⁹ *Pl. Grg.* 502d; *Leg.* 658C-D.

¹⁰ *Ar. Pax* 962-967.

which he seated men and women separately and also divided prostitutes from free women.¹¹ The second, a fragment from the *Gynecocrazia* of Alexis dating between the mid fourth and early third centuries B.C.E., states that an unknown number of women must watch the festival seated in the furthest section of seats of the theatre like foreign women.¹² This area could be the uppermost on either the left or the right side of the *cavea*, and it is possible that free women and prostitutes were assigned different rows within this space. It must be kept in mind that the legislation of Phrymachus may not be genuine and that the Alexis fragment is later in date and comes from a comedy that appears to be about women taking charge of the government. These two references do seem, however, to support the presence of women in the Athenian theatre and their separation from male audience members.

Tokens engraved with tribal names appear to have been used as theatre tickets and along with epigraphic evidence from other Greek theatres suggest that tribal seating was in use in the theatre of Dionysus in Athens, although how strictly it was enforced during dramatic performances is unclear.¹³ The arrangement of the *cavea* by tribe assigned essentially equal seating to most audience members, reflecting the democratic ideology of the city.¹⁴ Only those individuals with *prohedria* or reserved seats at the front of the *cavea* would have been visibly

¹¹ Scholion on Ar. *Eccl.* 22; Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 265, 269.

¹² Alexis *Gyn.*, Kassel-Austin, *PCG* F 42; Arnott 1996, 151-152.

¹³ Csapo and Slater 1995, 289-290; see Pickard-Cambridge (1968, 270-272) on the possible use and identification of theatre tickets. Tokens were also used in the West; see Chapter 2.

¹⁴ Winkler (1985, 30) suggests that the organization of the audience at the Great Dionysia in particular was meant to display "... (at least ideally) a kind of map of the civic corporation with all its tensions and balances. The fundamental contrast was that between the internal competition of tribe against tribe... and the equally strong determination to honor and obey legitimate authority, so that the polis as a

distinguished from the rest of the audience. This tradition of reserved seating continued into the Hellenistic period. In the theatre of Megalopolis, for example, tribal seating inscriptions date to the late third or early second century B.C.E.¹⁵

Roman evidence

The history of audience organization in at least some areas in the East prevents the organization of eastern audiences under the Romans from being attributed entirely to new legislation, and the impact of Roman practice must instead be limited only to modifying existing arrangements. Although the *senatus consultum* passed under Augustus ensuring that senators would always be given the front row can be seen as an extension of *prohedria* for magistrates and there is evidence for this privileged seating in the East, it does not seem to have been applied as a rule.¹⁶ In the stadium of Aphrodisias, for example, a senator had a seat in the eighth row and in the theatre of Laodicea a man of consular rank was given seats in the third row from the back of the theatre.¹⁷ The main change in spectator organization in the eastern provinces under Roman rule was the increase in stratification of the spectators, reflecting the Roman hierarchically-based ideology. More so than in the West, eastern audiences reflect both the

whole would display a united front against its enemies.”

¹⁵ *IG* V 451; Richards 1892, 122-124; Fiechter 1931, 22-23 no. 2. These tribal inscriptions were located on the backs of the seats and were later replaced by new tribe names on the fronts of the seats (below). For more on seating in Greek and Hellenistic theatres see Hübner (1858, 53-54); Winkler (1985, 30-32); Polacco (1987, 1-12).

¹⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 44.1. For example, in Stratoneika Marcus Cocceius Nerva, consul 36 C.E., was granted *prohedria* by an honorific decree (*IK* 22.1, no. 509; *AE* 1922, no. 30). In the stadium of Didyma a seat is inscribed διελεύσης (68.1.59); the term is equestrian in nature and may reserve this seat in the front row for an *eques*.

disparate social and civic structures of individual communities and also the manner in which some local elite used audience organization as a means through which to fashion a self-identity for their community.

The body of epigraphic evidence for seating in the eastern regions of the empire during the Roman period can be divided into the same categories as those from the western provinces: numeration within the venues and inscriptions from seats which reserved them for individuals or for offices and groups.

Numeration within venues

Unlike in Italy and the West few texts seem to have been designed to lead spectators to their seats. This must be because the design of eastern theatres and stadia did not generally incorporate complex pathways and a variety of entrances and therefore the identification of a route within the venue was unnecessary.¹⁷ *Tesserae* seem to have been used as theatre tickets in at least some venues in the East. The bilingual *tessera* from Issa was discussed in Chapter 2; another bilingual *tessera* was found in the odeon of Pericles in Athens, inscribed with Αἰσχύλου and the number thirteen in both Greek and Latin, perhaps indicating that a seat was reserved in the thirteenth row of a section of the venue named after Aeschylus.¹⁹ *Tesserae* inscribed with

¹⁷ 67.56.; 76.

¹⁸ For more on the architecture of Greek versus Roman theatres see below; see Chapter 2 for the internal routes demarcated in western venues.

¹⁹ Broneer 1932, 141 n. 2. An ivory theatre ticket was used in the theatre of Corinth which seems to have referred to one of the four *cunei* of the venue (Broneer 1932, no. 5; no date is provided). The identification of two *tesserae* from Jerusalem as theatre tickets is questioned by Segal (1995, 4 n. 6).

numbers corresponding to those identifying seats have been found in the Zea theatre at Piraeus.²⁰

Whereas the Greek *tesserae* generally contain only basic information, the purely Latin *tesserae* are more detailed and refer to the *cavea* (*ima*, *media*, *summa*), *cuneus* number, and row number.²¹ Again, this is a reflection of the differences between Greek and Roman venues; Roman theatres and amphitheatres were designed to display and emphasize the social hierarchy of the spectators, meaning that the *cavea* itself was highly stratified. Greek venues were instead more open and had fewer – if any – divisions within the *cavea* itself.²²

Seats in some eastern venues were identified by number; in several cases the venues in which seats were identified in this fashion were either constructed or modified during the Roman period. In the odeon of Alexandria, built in the late third to early fourth century C.E., one row of seats identified by inscriptions remains. In the thirteenth row from the bottom the seats are marked AX, BX, through to IΓX (IX, 2X...13X).²³ On the upper surface of each seat is a lunate sigma; the combination of the lunate sigma, chi, and number is particular to this row and appears to have been its identifying formula. Other individual seating blocks from this odeon are inscribed with a number alone or with different symbols together with a number. These symbols include a twig, a cross, a vertical line, and on the upper surface of some seats, a circle. It appears that only the five upper rows, twelve through seventeen, are numbered in this fashion.²⁴ In the

²⁰ Sear 2006, 4, 404.

²¹ Chapter 2.

²² See Chapter 4.

²³ Makowiecka 1971, 480; Władysław and Makowiecka 1973, 109.

²⁴ Makowiecka 1971, 480; Borkowski 1981, 96 no. 15.

eleventh row the first seating block is inscribed PNB which has a numerical value of one hundred and fifty-two.²⁵ This inscription does not follow the same pattern as that found in rows twelve through seventeen and it is possible that this change was meant to distinguish the first eleven rows in some way from those above.

A similar method of differentiation is found in the theatre of Aphrodisias, originally built in the second half of the first century B.C.E. but enlarged by the addition of the *summa cavea* under Antoninus Pius. Two of the steps between the tenth and eleventh *cunei* of this venue carry inscriptions, the fourteenth step an A and the seventeenth step possibly a Δ.²⁶ These letters may be numbers, one and four, indicating the seat rows. C. Roueché suggests that the numbers start so far up because they identify rows beyond those containing officially allocated seats.²⁷ In the south theatre at Gerasa, the first phase of which dates to 90 C.E., the seats of the outer *cunei* are numbered. The numbers begin at the bottom at A (one) and end at ΣΟΗ (two hundred and seventy-eight); three different hands are responsible.²⁸ Finally, in the theatre of Nablus seats in the first row that were assigned to a civic tribe were identified from one through twenty-one; the

²⁵ 81.6.

²⁶ 65.67.

²⁷ Roueché 1993, 113. In the same venue IB is inscribed in the sixth row of the third seating block in the sixth *cuneus* from the north, perhaps the number 12 (65.28). If in fact meant to be the number 12, this text seems to be identifying the seat. The fourth seating block in the eleventh row of the seventh *cuneus* of the theatre also carries the same inscription (65.39). Since the size of the seating blocks was not standard, it is possible that IB could again be identifying the twelfth seat. It may alternatively have been an abbreviation, perhaps for a civic group; see Chapter 4.

²⁸ Sear 1996, 222, 225. An inscription from Gerasa dating to the same time records that a T. Flavius provided 3,000 drachmas to build a *cuneus* of the south theatre (Jones 1928, 152-153, no. 13).

numbers move from right to left and are approximately 0.30 to 0.40 metres apart.²⁹ As in the West this seat width seems to have been the average; in Stobi the inscribed lines in the front row mark off areas 0.80 metres wide or larger which would have provided enough space for at least two spectators.³⁰ While the identification of seats and rows by numbers or symbols enabled spectators to find their seats quickly and in an organized fashion, the notation of seats with different patterns of numeration may also have served to distinguish those that were reserved, or assigned by specific *tesserae*, from those that were meant for general audience members. It is possible that the practice of identifying single seats increased during Roman dominance because of the higher level of stratification of the audience as well as the increased number of seats granted to individuals.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the presence of a numeral on a seat did not always serve to identify it. In some cases a block of seats was assigned to a group as a whole and the number thus granted was carved on the seats themselves. Clear-cut examples of this are found in the Latin catalogue but there is only one set of Greek inscriptions for which this may be the case.³¹ In the stadium of Aphrodisias several seats in the twenty-fifth row of the fifteenth *cuneus* are

²⁹ 78; Magen 1984, 275. In the Zea theatre at Piraeus, constructed in approximately 150 B.C.E., the first row of seats is numbered from right to left (Sear 2006, 404). Many seats in the theatre of Mytilene are inscribed with Greek letters or symbols such as a sickle and a dagger; the date of these inscriptions is not provided (Sear 2006, 4).

³⁰ Gebhard 1981, 16; Wiseman (1984, 579) provides a width of 1.05 metres. See Chapter 2 for the average seat width in the West.

³¹ Two of the inscriptions from the theatre of Aphrodisias mentioned above (65.28, .39) may have been identifying the seats rather than indicating the number of seats assigned to a group or to an individual, or they could equally have been abbreviations. For the western examples see Chapter 2.

inscribed either IA or AI, perhaps the number eleven.³² Since the inscriptions are found neither in the eleventh *cuneus* nor the eleventh row and cannot have been meant to identify the eleventh seat, if IA and AI are in fact numbers they may represent the number of seats assigned to a group. It is also possible, however, that these texts are abbreviations of the name of a group since the same inscription is found on the seats at either end of the seventeenth row of the twenty-eighth *cuneus*, perhaps indicating that the entire row was reserved for the group AI may represent.³³

Seats reserved for individuals

The increase in the number of inscriptions reserving spots for individuals rather than for offices is an indication of the move from Greek to Roman times and reflects the breakdown of the egalitarian image of the classical Greek *cavea*. Individually identified seats are appropriate in an audience in which the public display of social stratification is important and in which spectators have already been subdivided into various groups. Seats for individuals can then be seen as an indication of internal stratification within these groups.³⁴ While Latin inscriptions use the term *locus* (“place of”) plus the genitive to indicate a seat is reserved, the four terms used in Greek inscriptions are τόπος (“place of”) plus the genitive, and κατέχεται, προκατέχεται, and διακατέχεται (“reserved”) plus either a preposition and the genitive or the genitive alone. As in the Latin catalogue, not all texts contain reservation formulae, either because they have been lost

³² 67.41.

³³ 67.47; similar abbreviations are found in the odeon of the city (66.1).

³⁴ van Nijf 1997, 217. For more on this see Chapter 4.

or because they were never originally inscribed.³⁵ The formulae in Greek inscriptions reserving seats for individuals can be divided into the following categories: τόπος and the name of an individual, κατέχεται or κατέχεται ὑπό and a name, προκατέχεται or προκατέχεται ὑπό and a name, and διακατέχεται ὑπό and a name. The formula of τόπος and a name is the most common.³⁶ The formula κατέχεται ὑπό and its imperative form survive only in the theatre of Termessus, as do προκατέχεται and προκατέχεται ὑπό; inscriptions with διακατέχεται ὑπό may survive in the theatre of Pergamum.³⁷

In the stadium of Didyma two formulae were used that are unique to this venue, ἐπὶ and the genitive and ὀνό and a name in the genitive.³⁸ Inscriptions carrying ἐπὶ are far more numerous than those with ὀνό. Ἐπί appears to have been used to indicate that a seat had been reserved in an official capacity through the authority of the *prophetes* in office. These *prophetai* were elected annually from the leading families of Miletus; five candidates were nominated by each of the five local demes and then in a second vote the final choice was made.³⁹ The oracle of Apollo at Didyma remained active well into the fourth century C.E.⁴⁰ Although the eponymous office in Didyma was in fact the *stephanophorus* of Miletus, the office of *prophetes* was much

³⁵ Several inscriptions contain a reservation term alone, but they would originally have included the name of an individual, office, or group.

³⁶ This formula is found for example in the theatre (65.7, .17, .35, .40, .47) and stadium of Aphrodisias (67.8, .32, .33, .65, .68), in the theatre of Miletus (71.13), in the theatre of Stobi (7.57), and in the theatre of Termessus (77.3.9).

³⁷ 77.3.18, .6.2, .7.3, .8.2, .12.15, .12.18; 77.1.1, .3.22, .7.5, .11.1.

³⁸ Only one inscription, Ἀλεξᾶ ὁ τόπος ἐπὶ Ἀ(ρ)τεμίου (68.2.27b), contains both τόπος and ἐπὶ; it may indicate that a seat was reserved for the individual named in the year of the *prophetes Artemius*.

³⁹ Parke 1986, 124; Jones 1987, 326.

⁴⁰ Baker 2005, 406.

more prestigious and seems to be the office of importance in the seating inscriptions.⁴¹ Ἐπί is explicitly linked with the office of *prophetes* in several inscriptions.⁴² In other texts Ἐπί is linked with an individual identified elsewhere as a *prophetes*. For example, it is found with the name Artemon in two texts and this man is identified in two other seating inscriptions as a *prophetes*.⁴³ A Straton is identified as a *prophetes* in two inscriptions in which his name is associated with Ἐπί.⁴⁴ Several names are repeated in many of the seating inscriptions in association with Ἐπί, and these individuals seem to be the *prophetai* in office when the seat was reserved.⁴⁵ In some cases these names are associated with others, presumably the individual for whom the seat was reserved, whereas in certain inscriptions they stand alone, perhaps because another name has been lost. The repetition of the same names in this fashion suggests that Ἐπί was not being used to reserve seats for the *prophetai* named, but rather that the seats were being reserved through their authority. Although in quite a few cases the title *prophetes* is not included along with Ἐπί and the name provided, the title is included – and several of the names are repeated – often enough to make the association of Ἐπί with the reservation of the seat through the authority of the *prophetes* a reasonable suggestion. These inscriptions from the stadium are rather difficult to interpret.

⁴¹ Parke 1986, 124; Sherk 1991, 248-249.

⁴² 68.1.3, .1.7, .1.8, .1.18, .1.38, .1.39, .1.40, .2.26b, .2.35, .2.42, .3.11. In one text (68.2.35) it is linked with the plural, *prophetai*, which may suggest that two individuals held the office in one year.

⁴³ 68.1.33, .2.38; 68.1.43b, .3.8.

⁴⁴ 68.1.7, .1.8.

⁴⁵ For example, Philostratus: 68.1.5, 1.27, .1.30, .2.10b, .2.18a, .2.24, .2.25, .2.43. Stratonus: 68.1.7, .1.8, .5.1. Charmus: 68.1.9, .1.17, .1.40a, .2.7a, .2.50. Atticus: 68.1.10 x2, .1.17, .1.20, .2.11a, .4.8.

Of the three inscriptions containing ἀπό, in two cases the preposition is followed by Ἀρτέμωνος προφήτου while in the third it is followed by the name of an individual alone.⁴⁶ This last individual was most likely a *prophetes* who was not explicitly identified as such, as was frequently the case with the inscriptions using ἐπί, or whose title has not survived on the seat. A. Rehm suggests that the use of ἀπό is meant to indicate that the seat was reserved for the individual named from the year given, designated by the *prophetes* holding office, onward.⁴⁷ The identification of the reservation of a seat in a specific year may not have been the original intention of these inscriptions, however, and is not a phenomenon found in any other venue. The term should instead be taken to mean more generally that the seat was reserved during the tenure of office of the *prophetes* named and was most likely meant to be reserved from this point onward, perhaps for a specific individual. This must have been difficult to enforce.

The inscriptions in the theatre of Athens also carry formulae specific to this venue, κατὰ ψήφισμα and καθ' ὑπομνηματισμόν, both indicating that the seats were granted by an official decree. They serve the same function as *locus datus* or *locus datus decreto decurionum* in the Latin inscriptions, to indicate that a seat or block of seats was granted through official means.⁴⁸

Far more common than seating inscriptions with reservation formulae are those in which only the personal name survives. Many of the names are either abbreviations whose case is therefore unknown or the names are too fragmentary for their case to be determined. Of the

Sopoleus: 68. 1.13, .1.18. Sophanus: 68.1.17, .1.20, .1.22b, .2.12b x2, .2.26b, .3.9, .4.4.

⁴⁶ 68.1.43b, .3.8; 68.2.39.

⁴⁷ Rehm 1958, 102.

inscriptions whose case can be determined the vast majority are in the genitive and they might in many cases have originally been preceded by one of the reservation terms; several texts also survive in the nominative. A particularly interesting series of inscriptions concerns an individual to whom seats were granted in the theatre of Miletus. On each of the top three rows of one *cuneus* is inscribed $\theta\eta\lambda\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\tau\rho\omicron\upsilon$.⁴⁹ This inscription would have reserved approximately twenty places for the individual named, identified as Marcus Aurelius Thelymitres, a prominent athlete in Miletus.⁵⁰ Since three rows of seats were too many for one individual even were his family to have been seated with him, he must have allowed others to sit in these seats. It is likely that some of these individuals would have been members of the associations who are known to have erected honorific statues for him in the theatre, two groups of porters and the linen-weavers.⁵¹ The identity of the individual for whom a seat was reserved is not usually able to be determined and a suggestion for restoration can rarely be made with certainty, a difficulty compounded by the habit in some communities of reinscribing the seats when they were no longer needed by the original occupant.⁵² Inscriptions containing personal names can also present a problem in terms of the length of time during which the reservation of the seat would have been observed by other audience members.⁵³ The question arises whether when the individual in question was absent his

⁴⁸ 2.6i, .6m, .6o, .7k, .7l, .7o, .9a, .10g.

⁴⁹ 71.10.

⁵⁰ Herrmann 1998, 126; see below for more on seats for athletes.

⁵¹ van Nijf 1997, 223. A similar arrangement is found in the stadium of Aphrodisias, in which Claudia Seleuceia was assigned seats that she may have given to members of an association to which she was somehow connected (67.20, .21; below).

⁵² For example in the theatres of Aphrodisias (65.9, .18, .19) and of Athens (2.6n).

⁵³ See Chapter 2 for the difficulties presented by seating inscriptions.

or her seat would remain empty or someone else would sit in it. The inscriptions from the stadium of Didyma containing ἀπό are particularly problematic since they suggest that the seat was reserved from a specific point onward for an unidentified length of time.

Even more problematic are those seats bearing not only the name of an individual but also of the office held. While a seat inscribed only with the title of an office can be reused by anyone who fills the position, the addition of the name of an individual holding the office limits its use since future occupants would either have to have the seat reinscribed or be forced to ignore the existing inscription. There are several such texts in the Greek catalogue. In the theatre of Aphrodisias a seat is reserved for a Theodotus who is identified as the προτταυραρίος, the leader of the *aurarii*.⁵⁴ Quite a few inscriptions from the stadium of Didyma identify individuals by both their offices and their names. Seats are reserved for a tragic actor, priests, a high priest, wardens of the temple, an individual who may be a shell-fish dealer, a female agonothete, and an archon, all of whom are identified by name as well as by office.⁵⁵ Although the most common office for which name and title are listed together is that of *prophetes*, the *prophetes* named is not the individual for whom the seat was reserved. Texts in which an individual is identified by name and rank are less problematic since an individual's status was personal and could not be transferred; these inscriptions are equivalent to those identifying an individual by name alone. A seat in the stadium of Aphrodisias is reserved for an Attalus who is of senatorial rank, and in the theatre of Laodicea a seat is inscribed Παυλείνου ὑπατικοῦ indicating that Pauleinus was of

consular rank.⁵⁶

As in Italy and the West seats were reserved for both men and women. Eastern women appear to have been involved with their communities to a greater extent than their counterparts in the West. Women in the East could undertake restricted *munera* and act as priestesses for a number of deities, although it seems that they acted as benefactresses or *patronae* to communities less frequently than western and Italian women.⁵⁷ The number, or at least variety, of offices held by eastern women is much larger than that held by women in Italy and the West. To provide but a few examples: in the first century C.E. Mendora of Sillyon in Pisidia performed a number of duties including being a *dekaprotos* (an office concerned with the collection of taxes), a priestess of the imperial cult and of Demeter, a gymnasiarch, and a hierophant.⁵⁸ A woman from Termessus was a gymnasiarch in perpetuity and a founder of the local gymnasium, a female *lysiarch* is known from Sidyma, a woman was an agonothete in Didyma, and the *stephanophoria* and *prytaneia* could also be held by women.⁵⁹ The evidence for the involvement of eastern women with their communities comes primarily from the first and second centuries C.E.⁶⁰ These public-minded women were rewarded with honorary inscriptions and statues as well as on occasion with seats at games.⁶¹

⁵⁴ 65.56; for the *aurarii* see below.

⁵⁵ 68.1.23; 68.1.13, .1.36; 68.3.9; 68.1.43b; 68.3.12; 68.3.13b; 68.4.6.

⁵⁶ 67.56; 76.

⁵⁷ MacMullen 1986, 439.

⁵⁸ van Bremen 1985, 223 and n. 3, 6; for the office of *dekaprotos* see Jones 1940, 139-140.

⁵⁹ TAM III 58, 123; TAM II 188, 189, 190; Dmitriev 2005, 179-180; 68.3.13b.

⁶⁰ van Bremen 1985, 233-234.

⁶¹ For more on women in the East see for example Marshall (1975), van Bremen (1985), Trebilco

The majority of the inscriptions reserving seats for female audience members survive from Athens where women were particularly active in civic life as priestesses.⁶² Although the first row of the theatre of Dionysus was assigned exclusively to priests, priestesses were given seats in the second row and above. These seats were, however, almost always reserved for the office and not for the woman, as was also the case with men holding office. Other religious offices held by women for which seats were reserved include a barley-carrier and basket bearer.⁶³

A few women who were not identified by office were also granted seats in the theatre of Athens.⁶⁴ Two seats, for example, were reserved for an individual named Ladameia, one of which is fragmentary and the other in which the woman (although it certainly could have been two different women) is identified as τῆς Μηδίου, the daughter of Medeus.⁶⁵ A similar situation arises with three seats inscribed Μεγίστης κατὰ ψήφισμα, perhaps denoting that the same Megista was in possession of three reserved seats granted to her by a decree of the assembly.⁶⁶

Seats were also reserved for women in venues in other cities although not in so great a number. Carminia Claudiana, a member of a prominent Aphrodisian family, was granted her

(1991, 104-126), Dmitriev (2005, 178-188).

⁶² 1.13di; 2.6a, .6c, .6d, .6i, .6j, .7p, .8c, .8d, .8e, .8g, .9d, .10a, .10e.

⁶³ 2.6k; 2.7h. Seats were also assigned to young women who carried symbols in procession (2.6f, .6g) and to hymn-singers, most likely all female (2.6h, .8b, .8e).

⁶⁴ For example, seats were given to a Theoxena (2.11h), a Theano (2.12a), and the wife of Herodes Atticus (2.7i).

⁶⁵ 2.5a, .7m.

⁶⁶ 2.6m, .6o, .9a. Marcus Aurelius Thelymitres in Miletus (above) and Claudia Seleuceia in Aphrodisias (below) were also granted more than one seat each.

own seat – most likely originally located in the upper *cavea* – in the theatre of the city.⁶⁷ In the stadium of the same city Claudia Seleuceia was assigned her own area near the very back of the audience, some seats of which were allocated to members of an association; if the inscriptions are contemporaneous then she may have given them to the members of a group to which she was somehow connected, perhaps as benefactress.⁶⁸ In the same venue two women, Ignatia and Hypsicles, were given seats in the eleventh row.⁶⁹ None of the inscriptions for female audience members in Aphrodisias mention offices held, although this does not mean that these women did not in fact hold any.

It is not only in Athens that women holding an office were granted their own reserved seats. The female agonothete from Didyma mentioned above had a seat in the third row; the majority of the seating inscriptions for magistrates in this venue are located in the first two rows which suggests that this woman might have been purposely separated from her colleagues.⁷⁰ In the theatre of Termessus an area was reserved for a group of high priestesses of the imperial cult; although the text runs from the fifth down to the first row of the second *maenianum* it is unclear whether the entire area was devoted to these individuals or only a section of it.⁷¹ In the theatre of

⁶⁷ **65.88b**; Roueché 1993, 117; see Lewis (1974, 91M) for the family of Carminia. One of her relatives donated 10,000 *denarii* towards seats in the theatre. In the same venue a seat whose original location is unknown was reserved for an Apphia (**65.78**), and a spot in the sixth row of the theatre was inscribed for a Flavia, although this may instead be the name of a civic tribe (**65.29**).

⁶⁸ **67.20, .21**; van Nijf 1997, 222-223; cf. the inscription for the athlete Marcus Aurelius Thelymitres and his dependants in the theatre of Miletus (above).

⁶⁹ **67.26**.

⁷⁰ **68.3.13b**; a seat in the second row of the same venue was inscribed for a Claudia Bassilla who is the daughter or wife of a Xenophon (**68.2.36**).

⁷¹ **77.6.2**.

Delphi a large portion of the sixth *cuneus* appears to be reserved for the priestess Memmia Lupa, who lived near the end of the first century B.C.E., and members of her family.⁷² Only rows four and above of this *cuneus* carry seating inscriptions and it may be that the rows closer to the orchestra were reserved for magistrates and other important individuals in a different fashion. Seats are reserved for Memmia Lupa by name and office in rows four, five, and ten and her family name alone is inscribed alone on rows five, thirteen, and fourteen.

The evidence for women in eastern audiences suggests that although they were able to be active in civic life and to hold office, and were in some cases identified by these offices in seating inscriptions, they were not assigned seats in the first row. In the theatre of Dionysus, for example, the best seats priestesses were granted were in the second row. In the case of Herodes Atticus senior and his wife Alcias, he was seated in the second *cuneus* from the left in the fourth row and she was seated in the second *cuneus* from the right in the tenth row.⁷³ This is a contrast to the arrangements in the West, where women seem to have been able to hold fewer offices (and in fact no western women were identified in seating inscriptions by their office) but were given seats at the front of the audience. This, in some cases only minimal, segregation of women might have had its basis in earlier Athenian tradition. In classical Athens women might have been seated in the furthest *cuneus* of the theatre and it is possible that this arrangement was somehow transferred and influenced the location of women in eastern audiences under the Romans. The

⁷² 6.13, .14, .15, .22, .28, .30. For discussion of her family see Valmin (1939, 4). In the same venue a Cornelia had her own seat in the ninth row (6.21).

⁷³ 2.3b, .71.

lex Iulia theatralis, in which Augustus relegated all women to the rear of the venue except Vestal Virgins, and which seems to have been designed to be implemented in some fashion throughout the empire, would merely have confirmed this practice.⁷⁴

Although women were barred, at least in Rome, from the time of Augustus onward from attending athletic displays, seating inscriptions reveal that women were allowed to be seated in stadia in the East.⁷⁵ The inscriptions from the stadium of Aphrodisias are most likely late in date and may have been carved after the stadium had been modified for gladiatorial presentations, but in Didyma the female agonothete had a reserved seat in the stadium.⁷⁶ She may have been attending in an official capacity but it is possible that at least some eastern women were allowed to attend athletic presentations. Women in eastern venues, as in western venues, may have been granted the privilege of a reserved seat – no matter where it was located in the *cavea* – because of the status of their male relatives. In Athens a woman was expressly identified in her seating inscription as a daughter of a particular man, and Carminia Claudiana in Aphrodisias was a member of a prominent local family that contributed financially to the construction of the theatre.⁷⁷ In other venues women were identified as either wives or daughters of particular men.⁷⁸ The presence of these women in the audience might have served as a reminder of their male relatives and they can therefore be seen as acting as public symbols of their male family

⁷⁴ Chapter 1.

⁷⁵ Suet. *Aug.* 44.3.

⁷⁶ Welch 1998, 130-131. See Chapter 4 for the modifications to the stadium of Aphrodisias.

⁷⁷ 2.61; 65.88.

⁷⁸ 68.2.36; 77.1.3.

members.

Seats reserved for offices or groups⁷⁹

R. Heberdey has created a seating plan for the theatre of Ephesus and it is a useful point of comparison to the evidence provided by seating inscriptions for offices and groups.⁸⁰ The seating plan for the *cavea* of the Ephesian theatre is based not on inscribed seats but instead on inscribed statue bases, referring to civic groups, found throughout the theatre. These bases were erected at the behest of a foundation created by a local citizen and equestrian, Gaius Vibius Salutaris, in the early second century C.E. and were designed to hold statues involved in a procession for the goddess Artemis.⁸¹ On the front of each base was the dedicatory inscription by Salutaris to the relevant civic body (council, tribe, or other group) and on the back was an inscription indicating that the *cuneus* of the theatre near which each base was placed was reserved for the group named. It is clear that these seating arrangements were not newly instituted and the bases were merely making manifest what was already in practice.⁸²

Heberdey assigns the central of eleven *cunei* to the βουλή, the main civic body of eastern cities under the Romans. Although the extent to which the Romans attempted to force their culture (however it may be defined) on the inhabitants of the eastern empire is rightly the topic of

⁷⁹ The groups or offices for which seats were reserved by Greek inscriptions can be categorized in the following manner: associations and other groups, magistrates, peoples, priests, other religious offices, and tribes. Certain factional inscriptions on seats also have a bearing upon audience organization.

⁸⁰ Heberdey et al. 1912, 202-203.

⁸¹ These statue bases were erected between 104 and 107 C.E. (Heberdey 1912, 83; *IK* 11.1, 29-35). For the foundation of Salutaris see Chapter 4.

renewed study and debate, it is clear they did involve themselves to a certain extent with eastern communities through the avenue of the local elite.⁸³ It was by means of two policies that the Romans gave power to the local elite and created as well as perpetuated local self-autonomy.⁸⁴ The first was the creation of a property qualification for office (as existed for senators, equestrians, and decurions) although as in the West there may have been a huge financial gap between the wealthiest and less wealthy members of the βουλή of each community.⁸⁵ The requisite census amount for membership most likely did nothing but enforce what was already general practice, namely that the wealthiest individuals in the community were those who became members. The second change was to make membership in the council permanent barring expulsion, a policy which had more of an impact than the census requirement. This stipulation meant that the assembly was not as powerful as it had been since it was no longer responsible for electing members of the council, and the council came to be the most important civic body of the community. By the end of the third century C.E. most councils seem to have become permanent bodies. The presence of a council was in fact one of the defining

⁸² The text of the foundation refers to the placement of the statue bases above the *cunei* in which particular groups were seated and takes the seating arrangements as a pre-existing matter of fact (Chapter 4).

⁸³ The study of "Romanization" should not, and does not, focus on the eastern empire alone. For ways in which to approach the study of the influence of Rome throughout the empire see, for example, Barrett (1997); Freeman (1997); Hanson (1997); Ando (2000); Hingley (2005). For more on Greece and Asia Minor under the Romans see, for example, Sartre (1991); Alcock (1997); Goldhill (2001); Dmitriev (2005). For the "Romanization" of the Near East see, for example, Ball (2001); Millar (2001). For the influence of Rome on western communities see, for example, Hingley (1997); Webster (1997).

⁸⁴ The following brief outline of these policies is adapted from Jones (1940, 171, 176).

⁸⁵ See Chapter 2.

characteristics of city status in Asia Minor and the Near East under the Romans.⁸⁶ The councils, and indeed the communities themselves, of the eastern provinces are discussed here in a general fashion and with the focus upon seating in spectacular venues, an approach which in some ways highlights, but in other ways obscures, the differences between the civic and social structures of disparate communities. It must be stressed that the East was made up of diverse peoples and although many areas had been Hellenized, ethnic composition, culture, and civic structure could differ greatly from region to region.

While a text found in the theatre of Ephesus may refer to the βουλή its original location is unknown and the only securely identifiable seating inscription for this body comes from the odeon of Gerasa in Jordan.⁸⁷ Although originally this venue had only one *maenianum* and may have been designed primarily to house political meetings, after another *maenianum* was added under Septimius Severus the odeon would presumably have fulfilled the role of a venue for entertainment as well. Theatres and odea in the East may have regularly played a dual role of edifices for entertainment as well as political meetings.⁸⁸ In the odeon of Gerasa the members of the town council occupied the entire easternmost *cuneus* which provided them with approximately two hundred and seventy-five seats.⁸⁹ The location of the council of Gerasa in the *cavea* does not correspond to the central location of the council in the audience at Ephesus. The seating of the council in the Ephesian theatre is reminiscent of the arrangements in classical

⁸⁶ Mitchell 1993, 180 n. 137, 201.

⁸⁷ 70.1: 80.1.

⁸⁸ For more on this dual function see Chapter 4.

Athens, where the *bouleutikos* was located in the central *cuneus* of the theatre of Dionysus.

Support for the allocation of the central *cuneus* to local councils outside of Ephesus comes from the theatre of Athens and is again based on the location of statue bases, albeit of a different nature. During Hadrian's visit to the city the council of the city dedicated a statue to the emperor in the central *cuneus* of the venue, suggesting that this is where its members were seated.⁹⁰

If the council was seated in the central *cuneus* in venues constructed during the classical Greek or Hellenistic periods (the theatre of Ephesus is originally Hellenistic), it is possible that this tradition continued unchanged into the Roman era. In at least some edifices constructed during the Roman period, on the other hand, including in the odeon of Gerasa which was built in 165/166 C.E., the council sat elsewhere in the *cavea*. J. Wiseman suggests that in the theatre of Stobi, erected at the beginning of the second century C.E., the members of the council might have been seated in the first two rows of the venue along with priests and magistrates.⁹¹ His placement of its members echoes Roman seating arrangements in the West, where the *decurions* took their seats in the orchestra or at the front of the venue.⁹² The evidence from the theatre of Ephesus and the odeon of Gerasa supports the allocation of an entire *cuneus*, whether in the centre of the audience or elsewhere, to the local council. The possibility that in other towns the

⁸⁹ Retzleff and Mjely 2004, 37, 41.

⁹⁰ *IG* 3 464; *infra* n. 102.

⁹¹ Wiseman 1984, 579.

⁹² Chapter 2. The councils of eastern communities tended to be larger than the local *ordines decurionum* of Italian and western towns (Jones 1940, 176), however, and in some venues its members might not have fit in the first two rows of seats.

βουλή was seated elsewhere cannot, however, be discounted.⁹³ Perhaps the construction date of the venue, whether it was Greek or Hellenistic in origin or built under the Romans, and the seating practices in use at its time of original construction resulted in different seating arrangements for the councils of individual communities.

Heberdey assigns the council of elders, the *gerousia*, of Ephesus a *cuneus* next to that of the βουλή although he does admit that it seems unlikely that they would have filled the area in its entirety. He suggests instead that its members may have shared a *cuneus* with some of the priests of the city. In Ephesus the *gerousia* occupied a secondary position to the council but was still an important body that managed the financial affairs of local citizens and cults including, under the Romans, the imperial cult.⁹⁴ Although a possible inscription for the council of elders has been found in the theatre of Ephesus its original location is unknown.⁹⁵ The councils of elders of other cities, particularly those in Asia Minor, flourished in both political and social roles under the Romans and in some cases were first founded during this time.⁹⁶ The main role of the *gerousia*, other than to serve as a body which managed the business of the imperial and other cults, seems to have been to take some of the financial pressure off of the local councils since a certain level of

⁹³ In rows twenty and twenty-one of the second *cuneus* of the theatre of Delphi are fragmentary inscriptions of Roman date that have been interpreted as possibly reserving seats for the local council (6.11, .12; Valmin 1939, 2). It goes against all Greek – and Roman – precedent that town councillors would be sitting near the back of the audience, however, and surely these inscriptions must instead be referring to something else, perhaps the name of an individual.

⁹⁴ Rogers 1991a, 63-64.

⁹⁵ 70.2a.

⁹⁶ Oliver 1958, 475-478, 494; the council of elders of Sidyma, for example, was established between 185 and 192 C.E. (TAM II 175, 176).

social standing and wealth was surely required for entrance into this civic body.⁹⁷ It is in the stadium of Saittai in Lydia that the only surviving seating inscription for the council of elders is found *in situ* and it reveals that this body was sharing a *cuneus* with a civic tribe.⁹⁸

In the theatre of Ephesus each of the six civic tribes was assigned its own *cuneus*, presumably in the same order in which they were officially listed.⁹⁹ The role of the assembly of the people decreased as that of the city council increased under the Romans. It was no longer responsible for electing members of the council and appears to have rarely initiated any political action, although this does not mean that it ceased to function entirely within the city.¹⁰⁰ In Asia Minor the assembly met into the late third century and was mainly involved in public acclamations for individuals; most of the surviving epigraphic records of the decisions of the assembly of the people are in fact honorific.¹⁰¹ The seating of tribes in the theatre of Ephesus is echoed by that in the theatre of Dionysus in Athens. When Hadrian visited the city in 126 C.E. the council and each civic tribe dedicated a statue to him in their particular section of the *cavea* of the theatre.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ For more on the *gerousia* see van Nijf (1997, 161-164).

⁹⁸ 73.12.

⁹⁹ Heberdey et al. 1912, 203. A list of the *neopoioi* from the mid-first century C.E. lists the tribes of Ephesus in order: Ephesians, *Sebaste*, Teians, Karenaeans, Euonumoi, Bembinaeans (*IK* 11.5, 1578a). The *neopoioi* were in charge of inscribing the names of new citizens on the wall of the Artemision (for example *IK* 11.4 1405.12, 1408.5, 1408.15, 1409.4). It seems that although the tribes in Ephesus had a role in civic life their members did not depend upon them for services in their private lives such as the provision of tombs, and instead turned to other organizations including professional ones (Roueché 1993, 122).

¹⁰⁰ Jones 1940, 177, 181-183.

¹⁰¹ Mitchell 1993, 201; see Roueché (1984) for acclamations in the later empire, in particular those made by assemblies in honour of individuals.

¹⁰² *IG* 3 466-469. In the middle *cuneus* there was a statue of Hadrian as archon of the city,

It is not the allocation of a separate *cuneus* to each tribe, however, that is supported by most of the seating inscriptions in other venues, no matter the type (theatre, odeon, or stadium). The one secure tribal inscription in the stadium of Aphrodisias is reserving only one row, presumably for select representatives of each tribe.¹⁰³ In the odeon of Gerasa three *cunei* were divided among twelve tribes.¹⁰⁴ In the stadium of Saittai it seems that two tribes may have shared each *cuneus*.¹⁰⁵ In the theatres of Hierapolis and of Stobi inscriptions assign seats to more than one tribe per *cuneus*, although in Hierapolis a tribe identified as the πρώτης Ἀπολλωνιάδος seems to have occupied the central *cuneus* in its entirety.¹⁰⁶ In two theatres tribes may have been assigned entire *cunei* as they were in Ephesus and Athens. The evidence for the seating of tribes in the theatre of Nablus is very fragmentary and the only tribe for which a complete inscription survives, the φυλὴ Ἡρακληίδος, was granted twenty-one seats identified

dedicated to him by the council and people of Athens (*IG* 3 464). The statue bases were found at the bottom of the first and sixth *cunei* from the east and the sixth *cuneus* from the west; since the middle *cuneus* appears to have been assigned to the βουλή, the names of the tribes on the statue bases corresponds to the order of the tribes in the official list (Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 270). In the theatre of Kibyra statues dedicated by three of the city's tribes to two brothers in 73 C.E. suggests that tribal seating was in effect. The number of known tribes corresponds to the number of *cunei* in the first *maenianum*, although since only three statue bases survive it cannot be stated with certainty that they acted as place-markers (Petersen and von Luschan, 187-189, nos. 242-248; Jones 1987, 370-371).

¹⁰³ 67.55. It seems likely that tribes, or at least some sort of civic bodies, were assigned seats in the odeon of the city but the inscriptions are abbreviations and not able to be resolved (66.1; see Chapter 4). If they are tribal inscriptions, they do not assign one *cuneus* to each group represented by an abbreviation. Similar abbreviations were found in the stadium of Aphrodisias but whether they represent tribes is also unclear (67.34, .44, .45, .46, .47). While tribes existed in Aphrodisias over a long period of time, they were not particularly prominent and their nature is unclear (Roueché 1993, 122).

¹⁰⁴ 80; Retzleff and Mjely 2004, 41.

¹⁰⁵ 73.

¹⁰⁶ 75; 7.8, .9, .10, .11, .61; Wiseman 1984, 578 n. 63. Although the inscriptions from the theatre of Hierapolis that can be resolved provide the names of only seven tribes, two more texts are fragmentary and the arrangement of the inscriptions in the *cavea* of the theatre suggests that there were thirteen tribes in total (Jones 1987, 365).

by number in the front row of the central *cuneus*.¹⁰⁷ Since twenty-one seats would not have been enough for the entire tribe it is possible that these were merely representatives or that the rest of the tribe was seated in the *cuneus* behind them. In the theatre of Megalopolis it also is possible that an entire *cuneus* was assigned to one tribe. In this venue the front row of seats was made up of benches, on the fronts and backs of which are found three sets of inscriptions, the earliest set dating to the fourth century B.C.E. and the second set dating most likely to the second century B.C.E.¹⁰⁸ The final set is Roman and comprises five texts that are inscribed on the front of the benches and identify five tribes of the city.¹⁰⁹ Since each bench is positioned at the base of a *cuneus* it seems likely that it served as a place-marker assigning the entire *cuneus* to a tribe. The benches for both the first two and last two *cunei*, free of inscriptions, may have been reserved for different groups in another fashion.¹¹⁰ While the evidence for the seating of tribes does not reveal a standard amount of space provided to them across the East, it does show that in some venues more than one tribe was assigned per *cuneus*. This variation in tribal seating may be due to the size of local tribes in comparison to the number of seats provided by each *cuneus* of local venues, but it also reflects the varied use of different venues in different communities. That is,

¹⁰⁷ 78. To the west of the central *cuneus* are two very fragmentary inscriptions for tribes located in the front row, although these seats do not appear to have been identified by number (Magen 1984, 275).

¹⁰⁸ The earliest inscription is a continuous text commemorating a dedication made by an Antiochus to the construction of the theatre (IG V 2.540; Richards 1892, 122-124; Fiechter 1931, 21-22 no. 1); the second set is a series of tribal names that are inscribed on the backs of the second through seventh bench (IG V 2.541; Richards 1892, 124-125; Fiechter 1931, 22-23 no. 2).

¹⁰⁹ 5.

¹¹⁰ Jones (1987, 136) suggests either that they were filled only when the central *cunei* were full, or that audience members who were not citizens were to be seated in these areas, an arrangement reminiscent of the Athenian tradition of seating foreigners in the outermost *cunei* (above).

seating for every member of a tribe may not have been necessary in venues that were not used for political meetings.¹¹¹

The next major civic group to whom seats were granted in the theatre of Ephesus is that of the ephebes (young men of eighteen years of age or older), who were seated to the other side of the central *cuneus* than the council of elders. Groups of young men were granted their own reserved area not only in recognition of their status in the community but also so that any demonstrations or inappropriate behaviour on their part could be more easily contained.¹¹² As for the council of elders, Heberdey admits that the ephebes in Ephesus most likely shared their *cuneus* with other civic officials. This sharing of a *cuneus* is consistent with the evidence from other eastern venues.¹¹³ In the stadium of Aphrodisias the ephebes, here described as “sacred”, occupied two rows in one *cuneus*. These two texts are thus far the only known references to “sacred ephebes”, and it is possible that they were a subdivision of the larger group related in some way to Aphrodite.¹¹⁴ In the theatre of Termessus at least two distinct groups of ephebes, one of whom is described as “emperor-loving”, occupied a large portion of one *cuneus*; unfortunately the *cuneus* in question has not survived in its entirety.¹¹⁵ Other groups of young

¹¹¹ In Philippiolis officials of the tribes were given reserved seats at spectacles in return for financial contributions towards the construction of the theatre (Sear 2006, 3); in Lopodunum in the western empire the same arrangement seems to have been in place for those members of the community who donated funds to the theatre (Chapter 2); see also Chapter 4.

¹¹² Cameron 1976, 77; Roueché 1993, 123-124, 138. See also Chapter 2. Partisanship would later have been one of the motivating factors behind such outbreaks; see below.

¹¹³ In the stadium of Didyma an ἐφήβορχος, leader of the local ephebes, had a seat in the second row although there is no evidence for the location of his ephebes (68.2.7b).

¹¹⁴ 67.52, .53; Roueché 1993, 95.

¹¹⁵ 77.13.4, .13.5, .13.6, .13.9+10.

men were assigned seats as well. The νεώτεροι, “younger men”, of Aphrodisias had their own area in the odeon of the city, as they did in the theatre of Miletus, and in both venues these younger men were assigned at most several rows of seats; in the stadium of Didyma it seems the νέοι, “young men”, were assigned only a few seats.¹¹⁶ Differences in the location of seats for young men may be explained by the size of the groups relative to the space provided by each *cuneus* of the venue, by differences in the local role of the young men, and also by the different functions of local venues (whether mainly for political meetings or spectacular presentations).

Individual magistrates were given their own seats that were generally assigned near the front of the audience, although they were in some cases scattered throughout the venue. Holders of offices that were at least nominally the same could in different communities be granted seats in different locations. For example, an archon had a seat in the front row of the theatre of Athens but in the third row in the stadium of Didyma.¹¹⁷ The placement of the archon further back in the audience in Didyma suggests that, at least in terms of the grant of a seat, the office was perceived to be more important in Athens. Seats were also reserved in the front row of the theatre of Dionysus for a βασιλεύς, the second of nine archons, a πολεμόρχος, the third archon, and θεσμοθέτοι, the junior archons.¹¹⁸ Although this arrangement is the same as that of classical Athens, seats for στρατηγοί were not at the very front of the *cavea* as they were in the fifth and

¹¹⁶ 66.2; 71.16; 68.4.10. Although νεώτεροι and νέοι can be used interchangeably to describe the age group older than the ephebes, these terms can also be used as equivalents to ἐφήβοι, and νέοι is often used to describe any group of young men (Forbes 1933, 60-61).

¹¹⁷ 1.6a; 68.4.6.

¹¹⁸ 1.6b; 1.6c; 1.7a, b, c, d.

fourth centuries, perhaps due to the post-Sullan changes in the Athenian constitution.¹¹⁹

In the first row of the stadium of Didyma was seated an ἑπαρχος, perhaps the Greek equivalent to a *praefectus*; gymnasiarchs were scattered throughout the first three rows and the female agonotheite sat in the third row.¹²⁰ It seems that in Didyma not only was the female agonotheite separated from other office holders but also that the location of seats granted to men holding the same office was not standardized. It is not only the seating for archons that differed from community to community (Athens and Didyma); other offices that were the same, at least on the surface, provided their holders with different seats in different places. In the Lycian city of Oenoanda, for example, current and former agonotheses were, unlike in Didyma, consistently given the privilege of a front seat.¹²¹ In the stadium of Aphrodisias the reserved seats granted to *oekonomoi*, financial administrators, were in a different *cuneus* than those granted to the “sacred” *oekonomoi* and the “younger” (νεώτεροι) *oekonomoi*.¹²²

The different locations of individuals within the same venue who held the same office may be due more to the date of the grant rather than to an official decision to separate these persons. That is, all the seating inscriptions within one venue are not necessarily

¹¹⁹ **1.3di**, perhaps **2.9c**: a στρατήγος might have had a seat in the theatre of Ephesus, but the original location of the text is unknown (**70.2b**). For the post-Sullan constitution in Athens, see Geagan (1967).

¹²⁰ **68.1.1a**, **.1.48**, **.2.35**, **.4.10**, **.3.13b**.

¹²¹ The text of a foundation for an agonistic festival established by Gaius Iulius Demosthenes under Hadrian grants this right; Wörrle (1998) publishes the full text for the festival and the line numbers provided in reference to this text are as per his organization. Mitchell (1990) provides an English translation; see Chapter 4. In the theatre of Mytilene an undated inscription may reserve a seat in the orchestra for an agonotheite and demarch (Evangelides 1958, 231).

¹²² **67.22**, **.23**; **67.49**, **.51**; **67.50**.

contemporaneous and one individual holding an office who was assigned a seat might have been given this privilege decades before or after another individual holding the same office. This phenomenon is not limited only to magistracies; in the theatre of Bostra the seats for ῥακόποιοι, wine-skin makers, were not organized in a group even though they were all located in the second *cuneus*.¹²³ This arrangement is a bit harder to explain than that for the holders of offices, since in general members of a professional association were granted seats together as a group. It is possible that in Bostra the number of wine-skin makers increased until new seating areas needed to be assigned, or perhaps some members were assigned separate seats as a sign of prestige.¹²⁴ In Delphi the seating of a particular civic body at first glance seems surprising. In the theatre the Amphictyons, members of an important and historic council designated by the Amphictyonic League but still active under the Romans, are seated in the thirteenth row of the sixth *cuneus*.¹²⁵ Although the location of their seats, near the middle of the *cavea* rather than at the front, is not on par with their status, the Amphictyons might have been seated in this area because of a connection with the family of Memmia Lupa, in whose section of the *cuneus* they were located.¹²⁶ The varying seating arrangements for holders of the same office in different communities can be explained by local practices and the motivations behind the organization of

¹²³ 79.5, .9, .11. For the seating of *collegia* in the theatre of Bostra, see below.

¹²⁴ See Chapter 4 for the individual differentiation of members of a larger group.

¹²⁵ 6.28. The Amphictyonic League, centered in Delphi, was formed in the fifth century B.C.E. by several Greek states as a means of increasing their resources for warfare. The Amphictyonic council comprised delegates from each state and was in charge of juridical processes; for more on this League see for example Bonner and Smith (1943).

¹²⁶ Valmin 1939, 4; see above for Memmia Lupa.

spectators.¹²⁷ Since audience arrangements reflect not only the different social and civic structures of individual communities but also an idealized society as it was structured by the local elite, variation in the organization of spectators is to be expected.

The religious personnel for whom seats were reserved in some cases reflect the specific religious nature of a community.¹²⁸ By far the most common office to whose holders seats were granted in the theatre of Dionysus in Athens was that of priest; although priestesses and individuals occupying other religious offices were accorded the same honour their seats were not located in the first row. Inscriptions survive for priests of, among other gods, Zeus, Dionysus, Apollo, and Poseidon; the seat for the priest of Dionysus, the deity to whom the theatre was dedicated, was located in the centre of the first row.¹²⁹ Seats were also reserved for various manifestations of female deities such as Athena, Hestia, Demeter, and Aphrodite.¹³⁰ Individuals undertaking Roman priesthoods including those of the imperial cult are seated among persons holding traditional Greek offices. Some of the seats for the holders of Roman religious offices are found in the first row of the theatre, a privileged location shared by the priest of Dionysus.

¹²⁷ For more on this see Chapter 4.

¹²⁸ In many communities seats were reserved for priests on an individual basis. For example, in the second century C.E. in Rhodiapolis, Lycia, one Herakleitos, priest of Asclepius and Hygeia as well as a doctor, was honoured with front seating at public spectacles (Lewis 1974, 96D). In Xanthos in Lydia a Quintus Veranius Tlepolemos, who was a high priest of the *Augusti*, was granted front seating for life at public spectacles (Lewis 1974, 90J).

¹²⁹ 1.1a, .1d, .12a, .12b, .13e, .14c, .16b; 1.1c, .12c, .13b, .16e, 2.6b, .7q; 1.2e, .11d, .13c, .15e, .16f; 1.11c, .12e.

¹³⁰ 1.13di; 2.6j, .10a; 2.8c; 2.10e. The title *κουροτρόφος ἐξ Ἀγλαύρου* is inscribed on a seat and seems to refer to a priest or priestess of Aglaurus, the daughter of Cecrops who was worshipped on the Acropolis (2.10h). In quite a few cases only the name of the deity survives but it is safe to assume that the seats were reserved for the priest or priestess.

These offices are the priest and high priest of Augustus Caesar, the priest of Hadrian

Eleutheraius, the priest of the Demos, Graces, and *Roma*, and the priest of Antinöos.¹³¹

Reserved seats for other Roman offices are scattered throughout the audience.

Although the majority of the seating inscriptions from the theatre of Dionysus are Hadrianic in date, the text for the ἱερέυς καὶ ἀρχιερέως Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος, the priest and high priest of Augustus Caesar, is of particular interest since it is evidence for perhaps the earliest cult of Augustus at Athens.¹³² This inscription was in fact modified and originally reserved the seat for the ἱερέως Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος, the priest of Augustus Caesar.¹³³ This text is a reminder that although Augustus insisted that provincial cults in his name were to worship both him and *Roma*, at the municipal level he was willing to be honoured alone.¹³⁴ At some point after the original inscription was carved the title ἀρχιερέως, high priest, was added. This expansion in the title of the office for which the seat was reserved seems at first to denote that the priest of Augustus Caesar had become the most important priest of the city. A. Spawforth suggests instead that ἀρχιερέως was meant to elevate the standing of the individual priest (as a personal honorific perhaps in return for some public beneficence) rather than the standing of the cult, since until the time of Nero this title was not automatically assigned to the priest of the imperial cult in Athens.¹³⁵ This delay in emphasizing the importance of the imperial cult may be

¹³¹ 1.5b, .5c, .10b, .13d.

¹³² 1.5b.

¹³³ Maas 1972, 116.

¹³⁴ Dio Cass. 51.20.6-7; Spawforth 1997, 184.

¹³⁵ Spawforth 1997, 184-186.

evidence of cautiousness on the part of the Athenians against elevating this priesthood above more traditional ones.¹³⁶

Although the development of the imperial cult in Athens follows the general pattern found elsewhere in the East, there are some local peculiarities.¹³⁷ Among them, it was not until the time of Claudius that the festivities for the imperial cult were incorporated into a local civic festival, the Panathenaia, even though they had been celebrated since the time of Augustus, and it was also not until this time that Roman citizens served as imperial cult personnel.¹³⁸ The apparent lack of desire to permanently incorporate the imperial cult into religious and civic life in Athens coincides with a period of political unrest that resulted in a rebellion in 13 C.E.; the first years of the worship of the cult in Athens were not a time of peace and acceptance of Roman rule.¹³⁹ The imperial cult eventually became part of the religious structure of Athens, and Hadrian established three new agonistic festivals at Eleusis that were related to it, the Panhellenia, the Hadrianeia, and the Olympeia (the priesthoods for which are mentioned in seating inscriptions).¹⁴⁰ The *cavea* of the theatre of Dionysus provides a striking visual example of the co-existence of traditional Athenian civic institutions with Roman ones. The large number

¹³⁶ Spawforth 1997, 193.

¹³⁷ For more on the imperial cult in the East see Chapter 4.

¹³⁸ Spawforth 1997, 192-193.

¹³⁹ Spawforth (1997, 192) suggests that the causes of this civil unrest were complex but may have included conflicting loyalties among the city's elite and Athenian "nationalism". Hoff (1989) outlines the troubled history of the Romans and Athens. He includes (1989, 270) among the many causes of the distrust and resentment the Athenians felt towards the Romans not only that they were on the losing side against both Caesar and Octavian, but also the desecration of the city's monuments beginning with Sulla's soldiers and continuing under later Republican governors.

¹⁴⁰ van Nijf 2001, 320; **1.2b**.

of seating inscriptions in this theatre for the holders of both Greek and Roman religious offices echoes the religious nature of the festivals that took place in this venue.¹⁴¹

In the stadium of Didyma the most common religious office mentioned in seating inscriptions was that of *prophetes*. The presence of the name of a *prophetes*, however, was not an indication that the seat was reserved for him but rather that the seat was reserved through his authority. Some seats appear to be reserved in this manner for an unspecified amount of time.¹⁴²

Texts from this stadium also refer to priests of deities whose names have been lost and to a priest of the imperial cult.¹⁴³ Other individuals involved with religious festivals (hymn-singers, chorus-leaders, and a tragic actor) had their own seats as well.¹⁴⁴ Athletic competitions of the sort that would have taken place in the stadium of Didyma had an essential function in the Roman East. The presentation of Greek agonistic festivals was an important way in which eastern cities negotiated their relationship with Roman rule since many of these festivals were established through the imperial cult.¹⁴⁵ They were also a means by which eastern cities could make a claim to a Hellenized identity as their political autonomy was reduced, since these festivals all shared a

¹⁴¹ For more on this see Chapter 4. Other religious offices assigned reserved seats include the ἐξηγήται, interpreters of oracles (1.1b, .11a), the ἱερομνήμων, magistrates involved with religious affairs (1.5a), and φαιδύνται, cleaners of religious statues (1.14a, .15d). Seats were also granted to ἐρσηφόροι, young women who carried symbols in procession (2.6f, .6g), ὕμνητριαι, female hymn-singers (2.6h, .8b, .8e), an ὀληφόρος, a female barley carrier (2.6k), and a στεφανηφόρος, a crown-bearer (2.8a).

¹⁴² 68.1.43b, .2.39, .3.8.

¹⁴³ 68.1.13, .1.36, .3.9. Seats were also granted to the *Tibeireioi*, individuals involved in a cult association for Tiberius (68.1.61; van Nijf 1997, 227).

¹⁴⁴ 68.2.45, .3.11; 68.1.49; 68.1.23.

¹⁴⁵ See Mitchell (1993, 219-225) for a list of such festivals; for more on the imperial cult see Chapter 4. For the reserved seating of victors in these athletic competitions see below.

common structure and organization.¹⁴⁶

It was not always the case that the cities that established such Greek-style agonistic festivals had a strong claim to this identity, as is demonstrated by the foundation established in Lycian Oenoanda by Gaius Julius Demosthenes. During the time of Hadrian, he provided the funding for a festival which was to be named the *Demostheneia*.¹⁴⁷ Although the festival is traditional in nature and appears to be merely recalling the Greek past of the city, Oenoanda did not appear until the third century B.C.E. when it was founded as a colony of Termessus. It was only under the Romans that Greek-style public buildings were erected in Lycia as a whole and that individual cities began to claim such an identity en masse.¹⁴⁸ Demosthenes' provision of funds for this festival therefore did not refer back to the Greek history of the city but represented instead an innovation. Greek identity was something that was used by eastern cities of disparate social and civic structures in different regions to provide a place for themselves within the larger Roman empire. The claim to this identity through Greek-style festivals was, as is mentioned above, generally associated with the imperial cult. The inscription of the foundation of Demosthenes is prefaced by a letter from Hadrian to the inhabitants of Oenoanda that discusses his good character, and the high priest and priestess of the imperial cult were the only Roman elements involved in the procession associated with the festival.¹⁴⁹ The imperial cult was a

¹⁴⁶ van Nijf 2001, 310.

¹⁴⁷ For more on Demosthenes and this festival, as well as the similar foundation of Gaius Vibius Salutaris in Ephesus, see Chapter 4.

¹⁴⁸ van Nijf 2001, 315-316.

¹⁴⁹ II 1-6, 70. The involvement of the two imperial cult personnel as well of the inhabitants of the

particularly useful tool for the elite of these communities, such as the *ekues* Demosthenes, who were responsible for funding these festivals. These acts of public beneficence were a way in which individuals could advertise their generosity and elevated social standing. They were also a means by which local elite could declare to, and impose upon, their communities their own personal political and ideological views including the “importance of being Greek in a contemporary world, the realities of Roman power, and the principles underlying the social hierarchy.”¹⁵⁰ This creation of a local self-identity for the inhabitants of eastern communities was also expressed through seating arrangements in spectacular venues.

The participation in these athletic competitions by individuals in the community, who as during classical Greek and Hellenistic times were the elite (although individuals of a lower social status and perhaps even slaves could now participate), allowed these athletes to define a place for themselves within Graeco-Roman society.¹⁵¹ In the theatre of Termessus victors in sacred contests were granted seats and in the stadium of Aphrodisias two separate seats in the same

surrounding villages in the procession was not included in the first draft of the foundation, and it was only after almost a year of negotiation that they became part of it. Rogers (1991b) suggests that this negotiation implies that the manner in which symbols of Rome were to be involved was an issue of debate, and that their inclusion does not, as Wörrle (1988, 257-258) argues, mean that there were no tensions between this eastern city and the power of Rome. For more on this foundation see Chapter 4.

¹⁵⁰ van Nijf 2001, 314. The combination of historical, political, and religious motivation behind sacred games that made them so important for the self-structuring of Greek communities in the Roman period is echoed in the procession and distributions organized by the foundation of Gaius Vibius Salutaris in Ephesus (Chapter 4).

¹⁵¹ van Nijf 1997, 218; 2001, 320, 329; Welch 1998, 120. As van Nijf (2001, 323) points out, since victory in these competitions generally resulted in cash prizes (the two categories of games were sacred crown games and prize games) successful athletes of a lower social standing who participated could become wealthy by the time they retired. For more on the importance of Greek athletics under the Romans see Mitchell (1990, 189-193).

cuneus were assigned to individuals who were victorious, presumably in athletic competitions.¹⁵²

In the theatre of Miletus, the prominent local athlete Marcus Aurelius Thelymitres was given approximately twenty seats to be occupied by him and his dependents, discussed above. In the theatre of Ephesus the sacred victors were granted seats in the “first” *cuneus* (although whether in the north or south end of the *cavea* is unclear) which they shared with a priestly grouping.¹⁵³ The grant of seats to athletic victors was a method of publicly acknowledging both the role of these individuals in civic festivals and the status that this participation bestowed upon them. This honour was not only reserved for athletic victory. In 79 C.E. in Delphi a citharist from Puteoli and his descendants were granted seating at the front of the audience at public spectacles, a reward for his victory in the Pythian games.¹⁵⁴ As well as this privilege the citharist was given Delphian citizenship, personal inviolability, and immunity from taxation. The list of honours accorded to this individual reveals in what high regard any victory in a sacred contest was held, and the inclusion of the grant of a front seat in this list reinforces the function of reserved seating as a mark of privilege and social standing in a community.

Members of professional *collegia* were also given reserved seats, and the presence of these groups in the audience is an indication of their, largely financial, importance to a

¹⁵² 77.2.1, .2.5; 67.59, .61.

¹⁵³ *IK* 11.1, 27.470-477. It seems that at some point the sacred victors and the priests were both designated by the term *chrysophoroi*; they applied as a single unit to the council of Ephesus to be granted a statue base in the theatre in order that they might participate in the foundation of Gaius Vibius Salutaris (Rogers 1991a, 56-57). See also Chapter 4.

¹⁵⁴ *SIG* 817; Lewis 1974, 94A.

community.¹⁵⁵ The large number of seating inscriptions for these associations, by nature comprising working individuals of a lower social status, found in the East during the Roman period is evidence of the transition from Hellenic to Roman domination (below). Professional associations attempted to define an official place for themselves in the new, hierarchically-structured civic structure and seating inscriptions for these *collegia* throughout the eastern provinces demonstrate that they were successful at doing so in many communities.¹⁵⁶ Membership in a *collegium* was a way, often the only way, in which an individual of lower social status could obtain a reserved seat in a spectacular venue and therefore establish himself within Graeco-Roman society.¹⁵⁷

Two *collegia* in particular stand out among those who were granted reserved seats. In the theatre of Aphrodisias a *προτοαυραρίος*, chief *aurarius*, had his own seat while in the stadium of the city seats were reserved for *aurarii* in general.¹⁵⁸ Members of this association also had seats in the theatre of Miletus, where they were subdivided into different groups: the *ἐπινικίοι αὐραρίοι* and the *φιλαγούστοι αὐραρίοι*.¹⁵⁹ *Ἐπινικίος*, the equivalent to the Latin *triumphalis*, is very rarely used of people and here it may be used of the *aurarii* due to the association of victory announcements and the demands for tax in gold, a process in which they

¹⁵⁵ Futrell 2000, 165.

¹⁵⁶ van Nijf 1997, 246-247.

¹⁵⁷ Kolendo 1981, 315; van Nijf 1997, 240; Chapter 4.

¹⁵⁸ 65.56b; 67.67.

¹⁵⁹ 71.1, .4, .6, .14; 71.6; 71.14. Other *aurarii* in the theatre of Miletus were associated with the Blues (71.1); for more on the factions see below.

would have played an important role.¹⁶⁰ Although *aurarii* generally translates as “gold-workers”, C. Roueché suggests that some or all of these individuals were bankers, working with gold as money rather than with gold as a craft.¹⁶¹ In the theatre of Bostra individuals of a similar nature, the χρυσοχόοι or gold-smiths, were granted reserved seating.¹⁶²

Another group for which seats were reserved in more than one community are the λινούργοι, linen-workers.¹⁶³ Seating inscriptions in the stadium of Saittai and the odeon of Gerasa reveal that in these towns this *collegium* seems to have attained tribal status. Although these texts are the only evidence for the reserved seating of what appear to be tribes of a professional nature, such tribes existed in Philadelphia near Saittai. In this community the term φυλῇ, tribe, was used to describe trade groups and they were among (if they did not comprise all of) the seven official tribes of the city.¹⁶⁴ In the stadium of Saittai the linen-workers may have had up to six rows of seats and one of these rows appears to have been devoted to the younger members of the association, the λινούργοι νεωτέροι.¹⁶⁵ The existence of an association of linen-workers in Saittai is attested during the late second and early third centuries C.E., the period

¹⁶⁰ Roueché 1995, 48-49, where she discusses, and refutes, Cameron’s (1976, 248) suggestion that these individuals – in particular the “emperor-loving” ones – were claquers.

¹⁶¹ Roueché 1995, 41.

¹⁶² 79.7, .10.

¹⁶³ It was not only for the *aurarii* and the linen-workers that seats were reserved in more than one community. A group of λατύποι, stone-cutters, had their own area in the theatre of Termessus (77.8.1) and the λιθοκόποι, individuals in essentially the same profession, were granted the same in the theatre of Dionysus in Athens (2.2b). The inscription for these individuals from Termessus has been resolved both as the ὀρρεῶν λατύποι, stone-cutters associated with the imperial *horrea*, and as the ὀρεῖοι λατύποι, the stone-cutters from the hills (van Nijf 1997, 225).

¹⁶⁴ Magie 1950, 135-136 and n. 49; Jones 1987, 358 no. 10.

¹⁶⁵ 73.30-35; 73.34.

to which the stadium seating inscriptions date, and textiles were an important area of production both for the town of Saittai and for nearby Philadelphia.¹⁶⁶ In only one of the texts from the stadium are the λινοῦργοι expressly identified as a tribe; the other texts from Saittai are unfortunately fragmentary and the tribal designation has been lost.¹⁶⁷

In the venues of both Saittai and Gerasa the linen-workers are given seating on par with that for the civic tribes (to whom the majority of the seating inscriptions in both venues are devoted) and in the case of Gerasa at least it is clear that the addition of these individuals to the audience hierarchy required some reorganization of the previous arrangements.¹⁶⁸ While the majority of the tribal inscriptions from the odeon of Gerasa date to the second century C.E., the lettering of the inscription reserving space for the linen-workers suggests instead a date from the third century; this later date is also confirmed by the near complete erasure of two earlier tribal inscriptions that was necessary to make room for the new text.¹⁶⁹ That no other area of the venue shows similar erasures suggests that the linen-workers were added to an already existing arrangement in the audience rather than being part of a complete overhaul of spectator organization.¹⁷⁰ Although the inscription for the linen-workers in the odeon of Gerasa does not expressly identify their grouping as a tribe, whereas the texts for the tribes make this clear, the

¹⁶⁶ Kolb 1990, 118. Textiles and the activities related to their production were also important elsewhere; in Hierapolis, for example, an individual who supplied the purple dye for textiles had enough wealth and social standing to be elected to his town council (Meijer and van Nijf 1992, 107 no. 137).

¹⁶⁷ 73.35.

¹⁶⁸ 80.11+18.

¹⁶⁹ Retzleff and Mjely 2004, 40.

¹⁷⁰ Retzleff and Mjely 2004, 41.

addition of this group to the social hierarchy of the *cavea* which consisted almost exclusively of civic tribes implies that this *collegium* must have obtained a similar status. The presence of the linen-workers in the stadium of Saittai and the odeon of Gerasa is a testament to their increasing status, both socially and economically, within their respective communities.¹⁷¹

Whether or not these tribes of linen-workers had any political power, and in particular the ability to promote the interests of their or other *collegia*, is unclear. O. van Nijf suggests that these groups played only a symbolic role, but that their financial contributions to their communities were important enough that they were rewarded with seating in the audiences on par with actual civic tribes.¹⁷² As mentioned above, however, in Philadelphia at least some the tribes appear to have been actual professional guilds with full tribal status, and a similar situation may have existed in Gerasa and Saittai. The assignation of seats to the association of linen-workers is evidence of a societal change within these two communities, an increase in the status of this association and its acceptance by official civic bodies. This change is made manifest in the theatre of Gerasa by the re-cutting of seats to create space for this new element within the social structure of the *cavea*.

In Aphrodisias the majority of the inscriptions reserving seats for members of *collegia* come from the stadium, although some are found in the theatre, for example a text for the

¹⁷¹ Retzleff and Mjely (2004, 41) suggest that the linen-workers and presumably other professional associations may have been originally excluded from the formation of civic tribes on the basis of poverty. It is possible that this tribe did not in fact comprise only linen-weavers, but instead was named after a neighbourhood or district in which this occupation predominated and comprised individuals of any occupation who lived in this area.

butchers.¹⁷³ In the stadium seats were granted to groups such as the gardeners and the φρουμεντόριοι.¹⁷⁴ Roueché identifies these individuals as *frumentarii*, corn-dealers, rather than as the military personnel usually denoted by this term, although she acknowledges that there are no other instances of the use of the title in the same manner in Greek.¹⁷⁵ The tanners, as well as a professional association whose title cannot be resolved, also had seats in the stadium.¹⁷⁶ The absence of inscriptions for *collegia* in the odeon of Aphrodisias may be due to its smaller size as well as its different function within the community. This venue seems to have played a dual role as a meeting place of the assembly and a small-scale stage for musical recitals and theatrical presentations, a venue inappropriate in both use and size for the inclusion of reserved seating for associations.¹⁷⁷ Just over half of the surviving inscriptions in the theatre of Bostra reserve seats for three associations, indicating their importance in the economy of the city. Seats were granted to members of the χαλκατύποι, copper-smiths, the ᾠασκόποιοι, wine-skin makers, and the χρυσοχόοι, gold-smiths.¹⁷⁸ Contrary to the usual practice of assigning seats for associations, the seats for the ᾠασκόποιοι, although all located in the second *cuneus* of the theatre, were not grouped together in the same area. One seat with a back was found in the second *praecinctio* and another in the first *praecinctio*, whereas the other seats were located in the eleventh row of the

¹⁷² van Nijf 1997, 184-185, 233-234.

¹⁷³ **65.57.**

¹⁷⁴ **67.63, .4.**

¹⁷⁵ Roueché 1993, 85.

¹⁷⁶ Tanners: **67.28**; unresolved: **67.21**.

¹⁷⁷ See Chapter 4.

¹⁷⁸ **79.4; 79. 5, .9, .11; 79.7, .10.** Χαλκατύποι is an alternative spelling of χαλκοτύποι.

cuneus.¹⁷⁹ The practice of assigning blocks of seats to occupational groups was not, similar to the arrangements in place for groups of young men, meant solely as an acknowledgement of their status. This allocation of seats was also an effective means of crowd control for organizations that were often seen as subversive by those in charge.¹⁸⁰ In Ephesus the silver-smiths who wished to protest the teachings of Paul the apostle gathered as a group and entered the theatre, and in the late second century C.E. the bread-bakers of the city were rebuked after a strike.¹⁸¹ Trajan's edict to Pliny that associations should be disbanded because they posed the threat of political disturbance reveals the attitude of the central government.¹⁸²

In the stadium of Didyma areas were reserved for associations of young men and professional organizations, including perhaps the members of the σωληίσται, shellfish-dealers.¹⁸³ Seats were also assigned to the ἱεροκωμήτοι, individuals who seem to have belonged to some sort of religious village association that was officially recognized in the stadium.¹⁸⁴ None of these types of groups are specific to Didyma but certain texts refer to two unidentifiable associations that are, at least in seating inscriptions, particular to this community. Several inscriptions refer to οἱ περί followed by a name which varies; these imply a grouping

¹⁷⁹ 79. 5, .9, .11.

¹⁸⁰ See Chapter 2. Crowd control also played a role in factional seating (below).

¹⁸¹ *Act. Ap.* 19.23-41; *IK* 11.2, 215; Roueché 1984, 181.

¹⁸² *Plin. Ep.* 10.34.1, 10.96.7.

¹⁸³ 68.3.12.

¹⁸⁴ 68.8; Rehm 1958, 101. Village associations are found elsewhere outside of the spectacular context; for example both village and neighbourhood associations were granted reserved areas in a central square in Bostra (*IGLS* 6 2802).

around particular individuals.¹⁸⁵ The second group is what is identified as a τρικλίνον (the spelling is inconsistent) of an individual, and there is even a νεοτρικλίνον, perhaps a grouping of young men or a more recently established group.¹⁸⁶ Seating inscriptions for these two types of associations, revolving around an individual rather than a profession, appear to be unique to the stadium of Didyma.¹⁸⁷ The presence of a large number of inscriptions which mention some type of group affiliation suggests that membership in a larger body, whether through the tenure of office or another type of group identification, was important to audience members.¹⁸⁸

Several seating inscriptions identify individuals both by name and by occupation. A sculptor had his own seat in the stadium of Aphrodisias, in the stadium of Didyma a seat may have been reserved for a shell-fish dealer, and in the theatre of Termessus an individual who was a rhetor was granted his own seat.¹⁸⁹ While it is not clear whether these seats were located in an area in which others of the same profession were seated, the inclusion of the profession in the inscription suggests that these individuals chose to be identified in a fashion that made them a part of a larger group, membership in which provided them with the reserved seats. At the same time the inclusion of personal names in these texts reveals that these individuals, although affiliated with a larger group, wished also to be personally identified. This dual form of

¹⁸⁵ 68.1.6, .1.15, .1.39, .1.44, .2.22, .2.37, .2.50, 3.16.

¹⁸⁶ 68. 1.18, .1.30, .1.43b, .1.48, .1.50, .2.3, .2.10b, .2.30, .2.32a, .2.38, .2.42, 3.1; 68.1.30, .1.48.

¹⁸⁷ In Aphrodisias a series of benches carrying abbreviations were found. These abbreviations could all represent names commonly found in the city and Roueché (1993, 123) suggests that they may represent groupings around a prominent individual from the city in the late fifth century C.E. Some, if not all, of the inscriptions from Didyma are of a much earlier date.

¹⁸⁸ See Chapter 4.

¹⁸⁹ 67.14; 68.3.12; 77.12.16.

identification is evidence of internal stratification within the larger whole.¹⁹⁰

In the East as in the West peoples external to communities could be granted reserved seats in local venues. In the stadium of Aphrodisias visitors from Mastaura and Antioch on the Meander were assigned seats, as perhaps were individuals from Miletus and Kibyra.¹⁹¹ In either the stadium or theatre of Ephesus, seats were reserved for individuals from Keramus in Caria on the occasion of the second celebration of the Hadrianeia held around 128 C.E.¹⁹² The individual on account of whom these seats were reserved, an Ulpus Aristocratus, was an agonotheite who originally came from Keramus. Peoples distinguished by religious as well as geographic identity were also given their own areas. Jews were assigned seats in the odeon of Aphrodisias as ἑβραίοι and in the theatre of Miletus as Εἰουδέοι.¹⁹³ One such inscription from Miletus reads τόπος Εἰουδέων τῶν καὶ Θεοσεβίων; yet another reserves a seat for θεοσεβίοι.¹⁹⁴ The meaning of this term and its association with the Jews has been debated and the inscription from Miletus demonstrating a connection between the two groups has been translated in four ways.¹⁹⁵

The first translation is “place of the Jews, also called proud ones”, taking θεοσεβίων as the genitive plural form of an adjective.¹⁹⁶ The existence of a seating inscription for θεοσεβίοι alone, however, reveals that the term could stand by itself and did not need to be expressly

¹⁹⁰ See Chapter 4.

¹⁹¹ 67.11; 67.62; 67.29; 67.64.

¹⁹² 69.

¹⁹³ 66.3, .4; 71.7, .15.

¹⁹⁴ 71.15; 71.12.

¹⁹⁵ Baker (2005, 413-416) provides a useful summary of the debate surrounding this inscription and his discussion is condensed here.

associated with the Jews. The second reading of the text is “place of the Jews and of the God-fearers”, accepting that the lapicide reversed καὶ τῶν and implying that the Jews are seated together with Gentile God-fearers.¹⁹⁷ A third interpretation is to take θεοσεβίον as “God-fearers” and as delimiting Εἰουδέων, providing a translation of “place of the Jews who are also called God-fearers”.¹⁹⁸ The fourth, and most recent, reading of the text is “place of the Jews who are of the group of θεοσεβίαι.” Here θεοσεβίον is interpreted as the genitive plural of θεοσεβίαι, a group name for the followers of *Theos Hypsistos*, “the most high god”, with whom the Jews may have associated themselves in order to obtain reserved seats at spectacles.¹⁹⁹

Despite the differing translations of this text, the seating inscriptions for Jews in Aphrodisias and Miletus reveal that they saw themselves as a group distinct from the larger community, one deserving of reserved seats in the theatre. The text from Miletus appears to be the only evidence for the Jews associating themselves with another group in a possible attempt to receive reserved seats. Although another inscription from the city’s theatre identifies the Jews as partisans of the Blues, this connection would not have on its own provided them with seats and it seems more likely that it was a relationship declared after the Jews already had their own area.²⁰⁰ Although

¹⁹⁶ Baker 2005, 413.

¹⁹⁷ Baker 2005, 413.

¹⁹⁸ For this argument, see Hommel (1975) and Baker’s (2005, 413-414) summary.

¹⁹⁹ This is Baker’s own argument (2005, 414-416). For more on the inscription and the debate surrounding it, see Hommel (1975), Schürer (1986, 167-168), Trebilco (1991, 159-162), Herrmann (1998, no. 940f), and Baker (2005). For the cult of *Theos Hypsistos* see Mitchell (1999); Baker (2005, 399-402, 406-410).

²⁰⁰ 71.7. For the relationship of partisans to other groups, see below. Within their synagogues Jews were subject to seating arrangements organized by profession. Individuals in the synagogue of Alexandria were divided into the goldsmiths, silversmiths, weavers (or rough weavers), bronzeworkers (or finishing

the Jews themselves were of course aware of their religious identity, it is possible that other audience members may not have distinguished them from other cult associations.²⁰¹

Factional inscriptions, acclamations or ill-wishes for the Blues and Greens that date to the later stages of the venues (generally to the late fourth century at the earliest), can also provide evidence for audience organization since spectators who were partisans of one colour tended to be seated together.²⁰² In the odeon of Alexandria four factional inscriptions are in favour of the Greens and another is in favour of the Blues.²⁰³ One of the texts for the Greens refers to the νέων προσίων, perhaps a newer group of partisans or a group of young men who wished to be in some way distinguished from other followers of that colour.²⁰⁴ Although only the central and western portions of the *cavea* have survived, the followers of the Blues and Greens appear to have been seated separately, with the Greens located in the western half of the audience and the lone Blue partisan near the centre. The rest of the followers of the Blues might have sat in the eastern *cavea*. The largest number of surviving factional inscriptions comes from the three venues of Aphrodisias. In the odeon the only factional inscriptions that survive are for the Blues; in the stadium one, possibly two, inscriptions are in favour of the Blues while another may be

weavers), and blacksmiths. These seating arrangements were in place to allow individuals from another community to meet those in the same profession and so that people from within the community could recognize members of a particular professional association (Rosenfeld and Menirav 1999, 259-262).

²⁰¹ Roueché 1993, 124.

²⁰² Cameron (1976) suggests that seating inscriptions for the partisans of the Blues and Greens reveal that the majority of the audience members did not in fact seat themselves according to factional affiliation.

²⁰³ 81.1, .3, .4, .5; 81.2.

²⁰⁴ 81.3; for associations of young men as partisans see Cameron (1976, 75ff).

either in favour of or against the Greens.²⁰⁵ In the theatre of the city four inscriptions are in favour of the Blues, three of which are acclamations and one of which is an ill-wish for the Greens.²⁰⁶ Four inscriptions from this venue are acclamations in favour of the Greens.²⁰⁷ The division between the followers of the Blues and Greens in the theatre audience is clear. The inscriptions favouring the Blues are found in the southern end of the theatre and those favouring the Greens, along with an acclamation not on a seat and an inscription mentioning a Green mime, are located in the northern end.²⁰⁸ The separation of the partisans in the audience was a natural arrangement – followers of a group tend to sit together to share in a common emotion – but it was also useful in that it may have helped to prevent extreme factional violence. It would have been dangerous to be a solitary and active partisan of the Blues surrounded by followers of the Greens, or vice versa. Of course, when partisans were seated in blocks it also made it much easier to identify who was a fan of which colour and conflict was not infrequent.²⁰⁹

One text from the theatre of Aphrodisias praises not a faction, but an individual by means of the formula of a factional acclamation. Theodotus, the head of the *aurarii* (gold-workers or perhaps bankers), is acclaimed using the standard $\nu\iota\kappa\tilde{\alpha}\ \eta\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$, “The fortune triumphs...”²¹⁰

²⁰⁵ 66.4-6; 67.6, .18; 67.10.

²⁰⁶ 65.40i, .57, .69; 65.13.

²⁰⁷ 65.22i, ii, .23, .76. Two other inscriptions may be acclaiming one of the factions but may also be in favour of another group or association (Roueché 1993, 46.B.1, E.2).

²⁰⁸ Roueché 1993, 99. Acclamation for the Greens not found on a seat: Roueché 1993, 8e; inscription mentioning a Green mime: Roueché 1993, 1.1.iii.

²⁰⁹ Cameron 1976, 271-296; see Chapter 2 for the (non-factional) riot of the Pompeians and the Nuceriaans, which may have been exacerbated because the inhabitants of each town were clearly distinguishable in the audience.

²¹⁰ 65.56b; see above for the *aurarii*.

The connection between the *aurarii* and a faction hinted at in this inscription is made explicit in the theatre of Miletus where seats were reserved for the αὐραροῖσι Βενέτοι, *aurarii* who were partisans of the Blues.²¹¹ Another group, the butchers, is also associated with the Blues in the theatre of Aphrodisias, where an acclamation for this colour accompanies the inscription reserving seats for the *collegium*.²¹² Certain Jews were also partisans of the Blues. In the odeon of Aphrodisias an inscription reserves a spot for the elder Jews who are identified as Blues and in the theatre of Miletus some of the local Jews declared themselves partisans of the Blues.²¹³ These inscriptions suggest that groups that already sat together at spectacles – the *aurarii*, the butchers, and the Jews – became as a group supporters of a faction, here the Blues.²¹⁴ That is, it was not necessarily the love of a particular faction that united these partisans but rather a common *collegium* or group identity that was then transferred as a collective whole to the partisanship of a colour. It may also have been the case that associations of young men became followers of a particular colour since they were already seated together as a group; one example may be the νέων προσίων, supporters of the Greens from Alexandria.²¹⁵ Not all of the factional inscriptions from the theatres of Miletus and the venues of Aphrodisias identify a particular group of people and their colour affiliation. Some are merely graffiti acclamations for the Blues or Greens. Thus it seems that there were individuals who chose to be identified and

²¹¹ 71.1.

²¹² 65.57.

²¹³ 66.4; 71.7.

²¹⁴ Roueché 1993, 131.

²¹⁵ Roueché 1993, 139. In later sources the term νέοι or νεανία is often used to describe groups

therefore seated both by their occupation, religious identity, or another marker of their place in society together with their partisanship, and then also individuals who chose to express themselves by their colour alone.²¹⁶ Some of these individuals might have been claqueurs, whose purpose in the audience was to incite support for a particular faction.²¹⁷

The influence of the Romans on seating arrangements in the East

Audiences at spectacles were organized as an idealized reflection of local society as it was envisioned by each community's leaders, but the overarching ideology of the larger empire in which these communities were found also had an impact. In response to the transition to Roman rule the nature of spectator arrangements in the East changed. Audiences were for the most part now reflecting a hierarchically-structured ideal rather than a more egalitarian one. At the most basic level, the architectural differences between Greek theatres and Roman theatres and amphitheatres emphasize these different ideologies.²¹⁸ The classical Greek *cavea* was divided into *cunei* but there was no other separation of the audience, no walkways distinguishing different levels or varying routes of access for different audience members. The minimal differentiation in the Greek theatre took place in the horizontal plane, that is, the division into *cunei*, rather than the vertical plane, the division into *maeniana*.²¹⁹

of partisans, such as in Procopius (*Anecd.* 7.23, 35, 42; *BP* 2.8, 11, 17, 28); see Cameron (1976, 75ff).

²¹⁶ For more on group membership as a declaration of the right to belong see Chapter 4.

²¹⁷ Roueché 1993, 132; also Cameron (1976, 234-249). For more on the circus factions, see Cameron (1976, esp. 79-80 for seating arrangements); Roueché (1993, 129-156).

²¹⁸ This is merely a brief outline of these differences; for a detailed discussion see Bieber (1939).

²¹⁹ Polacco 1981, 11.

Using the theatre of Dionysus as an example, there were two levels of group distinction at play in the classical Athenian audience, that between citizen and metic and that between tribe.²²⁰ Individuals who were not Athenian citizens, including women, might have been forced to sit in the outside *cunei* of the theatre. This visible distinction of non-citizen from citizen reflected the strict differentiation of these two groups in Athenian society. The rest of the audience, all men, was seated according to tribal divisions other than individuals who had been granted *prohedria*. The right to sit at the front of the audience was given to those who held the office of priest or magistrate. This distinction was based entirely upon the tenure of office and not upon any individual qualities, meaning that only the names of the offices without any personal identification were used to reserve seats.²²¹ During the classical period the spectators at performances in the theatre of Dionysus acted as a reflection of the citizenry of the city and undifferentiated seating, other than division by tribe, was meant to reinforce the social cohesion of this community.²²² D.B. Small proposes a model “which defines the society as a loosely articulated social structure in which diverse social settings were permitted to develop their own norms and conventions.”²²³ Within different venues in the same city those in attendance were allowed to develop a programme of behaviour particular to each location. The programme of the theatre of Dionysus was one of equality and social cohesion.

The organization of audience members at spectacles and the very design of spectacular

²²⁰ Small 1987, 86.

²²¹ Small 1987, 87.

²²² Longo 1990, 16.

venues in Roman society serves as a stark contrast to the arrangements in the classical Athenian theatre. The social hierarchy and visible evidence of its implementation in public areas where large groups of people were assembled was very important to the Romans. This meant that spectators were organized, at least ideally, in a fashion designed less to promote social cohesion and more to emphasize the differences between various levels of society.²²⁴ The free-standing nature of the majority of Roman venues, whereas Greek theatres were largely constructed against hillsides, allowed for the construction of passageways within the theatre building that gave audience members access to different levels of the *cavea*. No longer was the orchestra the only means of approach to a seat. The Roman *cavea* was also divided into *cunei* but the level of internal physical stratification was much greater than in the Greek *cavea*. *Praecinctiones*, walkways, divided the different levels of seating, *maeniana*, and a wall separated the area at the front of the venue meant for important audience members from the spectators behind it.²²⁵ The complex design of many amphitheatres is in particular an excellent example of the Roman drive to create a venue in which the spectators were not only separated according to social standing

²²³ Small 1987, 87-88.

²²⁴ While the design of Roman *caveae* and Roman seating regulations were meant to reinforce the social hierarchy, they also provided a public space in which this visible hierarchy could be openly challenged; see the Conclusion.

²²⁵ In Roman theatres and amphitheatres important audience members, usually the individuals responsible for the festivities and his companions as well as certain magistrates, were seated in tribunals, boxes over each of the two covered entrances to the orchestra (Chapter 1). In eastern theatres that had not been modified under the Romans, the area of honour was a central tribunal close to the front of the *cavea* (Wiseman 1984, 579 n. 64). In Greek venues the entrances to the orchestra were not covered, providing no space for seating, and the *cavea* and the stage building did not form a cohesive whole.

once they found their seats, but also during their journey from outside the venue to their seats.²²⁶

The excellently preserved amphitheatre at Nîmes is filled with different access passageways to different levels of seating and numerous stairways carry spectators to higher levels of the *cavea*.²²⁷

The alterations to the *cavea* of the theatre of Pompeii discussed in Chapter 2 provide an example of the impact of Roman ideology on theatre architecture.²²⁸ Another venue in which this change can be seen is the theatre of Syracuse. Originally constructed in the fifth century B.C.E., during the second century C.E. it was the subject of a complete renovation.²²⁹ The original Greek *cavea* had one *praecinctio*; under the Romans at least one other was added which divided the theatre into a minimum of three *maeniana*. In order to add a new *praecinctio* a row of original seats had to be destroyed, and in order to enlarge the orchestral seating now reserved for senators and others sharing the privilege two rows of original seats from the front of the *cavea* were also removed. The result of this remodelling was that the theatre became a venue appropriate for the display of the local social hierarchy.

The influence of Roman culture on stadia can be seen in those venues that were constructed or altered under Roman rule. Rather than being constructed against a hill, stadia could now be free-standing (in much the same way as theatres) and they had larger *caveae*,

²²⁶ See Chapter 2.

²²⁷ See Chapter 1 for the design of the Flavian amphitheatre in Rome.

²²⁸ Chapter 2; also Small (1987, 91-92); Moretti (1992); Zanker (1998, 108, 113).

²²⁹ Polacco (1981, 12-13) outlines the renovations and provides a hypothetical seating plan for the renovated theatre.

monumental facades, and a system for circulating spectators through the substructures.²³⁰ Unlike during the Greek period when the running-track of stadia had been the focal point of the venue, under the Romans it was the *cavea* that was emphasized. This reflects not only the hierarchical nature of Roman society but also the Roman view that spectacular venues were places in which people watched events rather than participated in them; conversely, it was participation that was most important to the Greeks and spectators either stood or were seated on banks of earth surrounding the track.²³¹

In some venues in the Greek-speaking areas of the empire seating inscriptions can identify ways in which a community changed as it underwent the transition to Roman rule. The change from an independent Greek *polis* to a city that was part of a much greater empire required the readjustment of relationships between cities and their inhabitants. The combination of seating inscriptions in the theatre of Dionysus for traditional Athenian offices such as the *strategos*, archon, and priest of Dionysus *Eleuthereus* with texts for Roman priesthoods mirrors the adaptation of Greek cities to Roman rule. The large number of seating inscriptions for professional associations, groups which by nature comprised individuals of a lower social status, found during the Roman period is also evidence of a societal transition. Another indication of the move from Hellenic to Roman times is the increase in the number of inscriptions reserving places for individuals rather than for offices, a result of the breakdown of the egalitarian image of the classical Greek *cavea*. These seats are representative of a society in which individual

²³⁰ Welch 1998, 120-121.

identification and status is important, rather than of one in which the collective whole is more important than the individual.

The theatre of Stobi, constructed in the early second century C.E., provides an example of the increasing importance of the individual in spectacular audiences.²³² Seats in the first two rows of the theatre were inscribed with lines indicating wider seat divisions than those in the rest of the *cavea*. These seats would have been assigned to those with the honour of *prohedria*: priests, magistrates, and, according to Wiseman, members of the council as well.²³³ Also carved into these seats were personal names, the majority of which cross over the division lines and therefore reveal that at some point the seats for *prohedria* ceased to be relevant.²³⁴ This suggests that familial divisions and personal identification became increasingly important in Stobi and took precedence over the less personal, and more egalitarian, reservation of a seat only for an office with no name included.²³⁵

Tribal seating inscriptions provide evidence not only of the transition to Roman times but also of trends during Roman domination such as the rise in stature of the linen-workers discussed above. In many of the venues in which tribes were granted reserved seats these units were named after Greek gods or after Hellenistic rulers, for example in the theatres of Hierapolis and

²³¹ Welch 1998, 120-121.

²³² 7, 8.

²³³ Wiseman 1984, 579.

²³⁴ Gebhard 1981, 15-16.

²³⁵ Small 1987, 89-90.

Megalopolis and in the stadium of Saittai.²³⁶ In three venues the names of the local tribes reveal Roman influence. In the odeon of Gerasa, constructed in the early third century C.E., the majority of the tribes are named after Greek gods but two texts identify a tribe named after the emperor Hadrian. This title would have been assigned to the tribe either during or after Hadrian's stay in Gerasa in 130 C.E.²³⁷ In the theatre of Stobi all the tribes identified thus far in seating inscriptions have Roman names, because Stobi was a Roman *municipium* and then *colonia*.²³⁸ In Ephesus the tribe *Sebaste* was named after Augustus and a statue base in the theatre of the city dating to 104 C.E. reveals that this tribe had reserved seating.²³⁹ Among communities on the western coast of Asia Minor Ephesus was the only one to have tribes named after Roman emperors, although this practice was common in the interior.²⁴⁰

In the theatre of Megalopolis the names of Hellenistic tribes were inscribed on the backs of benches in the first row of seats, whereas the names of tribes in the reign of Hadrian were inscribed on the fronts of the benches.²⁴¹ During this time the number of tribes was reduced from six to five, two new ones were added, and the endings of the names of three of the previously existing tribes were changed. The two new tribes, *Μαιναλίων* and *Παρρασίων*, were named

²³⁶ 75: 5; 73.

²³⁷ 80.10, .12; Retzleff and Mjely 2004, 40.

²³⁸ 7.8, .9, .11, .61.

²³⁹ *IK* 11.1, 28; Heberdey 1912, 83c. This tribe was given a prominent position in the procession created by the foundation of Gaius Vibius Salutaris, in which the statue bases in the theatre played an integral role; see Chapter 4.

²⁴⁰ Jones 1987, 295. For example, tribes named *Sebaste* were found in, among other towns in the interior, Claudiopolis, Nikaia, Nysa, and Ankyra (Jones 1987, 345, 348, 353, 358-362, 376-378).

²⁴¹ 5.

after the two main villages that contributed to the synoecism that created Megalopolis.²⁴² Instead of using the original feminine singular forms of the tribal names, the Hadrianic inscriptions use the masculine plural forms. Of the three previously existing tribes, two appear to have changed location in the *cavea*; the inscriptions for the tribe Πανίης / Πανιατῶν are on the back and front of the bench in front of the sixth *cuneus*, but the early inscription Ἀπολλωνίης is on the back of the bench in front of the third *cuneus* while the Roman inscription Ἀπολλωνιατῶν is on the front of the bench in front of the seventh *cuneus* and the original Λυκαίης tribe (now named Λυκαεῖτων) moved from *cuneus* seven to *cuneus* four. It is possible that the reduction of the tribes from six to five may be an indication of the declining population of Megalopolis.²⁴³

It is possible for the very location of seating inscriptions to reveal changes in audience arrangements. The theatre of Termessus, originally constructed during the Hellenistic era, was renovated during the Roman period; among other work carried out, its *cavea* was expanded under Augustus by the addition of an upper level of seating.²⁴⁴ The upper Augustan section of the *cavea* contains more seating inscriptions than the original lower section, in which three *cunei* are completely devoid of texts. In the first ten rows of the theatre some of the inscriptions are located on the vertical rise of the seats, whereas in the upper *cavea* the texts are on the flat surface of the seats.²⁴⁵ Quite a few inscriptions from the theatre are for individuals; ephebes, priestesses of the imperial cult, sacred victors, possibly a rhetor and a *prytanis*, and an association of stone-

²⁴² Jones 1987, 138.

²⁴³ Jones 1987, 138, 151 n.4.

²⁴⁴ Small 1987, 90.

cutters also had reserved seats.²⁴⁶ Some of the seats for individuals as well as those for the ephebes and the rhetor are located in the original *cavea*. Also found in the original *cavea*, in rows eight, nine, ten, and twelve of the second *cuneus* from the south, are texts reading ΓΝΑ.²⁴⁷ There is one such inscription per row, and each is located on the far southern end.²⁴⁸ These inscriptions are abbreviations, perhaps for a civic body of Termessus. No other texts of this nature are recorded in the rest of the original *cavea*, although very little remains of the southernmost *cuneus* and the third *cuneus* from the south is also fragmentary. Such abbreviations are not recorded anywhere in the Augustan *cavea*.

D. de Bernardi Ferrero suggests that that the texts in the first ten rows were meant to identify a seat in some fashion while those in the upper *cavea* were meant to identify individuals.²⁴⁹ There are, however, inscriptions carved above row ten in the first *maenianum* and seats for individuals are found in the lower *cavea* as well. The smaller number of inscriptions in the original *cunei* and the placement of many of the inscriptions on the rise of the seats suggest a clear distinction between the upper and lower *caveae*, although the precise nature of this differentiation is unclear. The texts in the upper seating section are clearly Roman and those reserving seats for individuals in the lower *cavea* most likely date to this period as well. It is

²⁴⁵ de Bernardi Ferrero 1966, vol. I, 17; Sear 2006, 3.

²⁴⁶ Ephebes: 77.13.4, .13.5, .13.6, .13.10. Priestesses: 77.6.2. Sacred victors: 77.2.1, .2.5. Rhetor: 77.12.16. *Prytanis*: 77.4.3. Stone-cutters: 77.8.1.

²⁴⁷ 77.12.3, .12.5, .12.6, .12.9.

²⁴⁸ In the same position in row eleven is carved ΓΥΝ (77.12.7), although its relationship to the other abbreviations is unclear.

²⁴⁹ de Bernardi Ferrero 1966, vol. I, 17; Sear 2006, 3.

possible that during the transition to the Roman period the seating arrangements in the theatre of Termessus underwent a similar change to those in Stobi where personal identification seems to have replaced identification by office. In Hellenistic Termessus the differentiation of audience members according to personal status may not have been important since the programme of the theatre was not one that necessitated a display of the social hierarchy.²⁵⁰ Under the Romans, when society became increasingly stratified, seating inscriptions for individuals seem to have become more relevant.

²⁵⁰ Small 1987, 90-91; see Chapter 4.

Chapter 4 - The Social Organization of Audiences Throughout the Empire

During the Graeco-Roman period there was an effort towards audience organization in many – if not all – theatres, amphitheatres, and stadia. Seating inscriptions found throughout both the Latin and Greek areas of the empire reveal that communities were concerned with the portrayal of the social structure in their local spectacular venue or venues. Groups, offices, and individuals deemed to be important to the community were given their own seats which were generally located in prominent areas of these venues. The assignation of reserved seats was a visible expression of the right to belong, of participation in civic life, whether political or financial (of course many times the two went together), local or on a larger scale. This participation was rewarded with public recognition and, in effect, the visual definition of the particular place of an individual or group in a community's social structure. The display of the social structure within a theatre, amphitheatre, or stadium was just that, an exhibition, a static visual production orchestrated for the most part by members of the local elite.

Spectator seating arrangements are therefore able to provide insight not only into the disparate social and civic organization of different communities throughout the empire, but also into the role of the theatre audience in the creation of a local self-identity. In Rome the reinforcement of the city's identity through spectator seating arrangements, carried out largely under Augustus, was directed both at the local population and at visitors to the capital. Individuals could attend the theatre or amphitheatre, find themselves surrounded by a static display of the Roman social hierarchy, and be reminded of their place within, or outside of, it. In

the provinces the local identity that was reinforced by audience organization, among other means such as processions and festivals, seems instead to have been directed mainly at the local inhabitants. Particularly in the East, the creation of a community's self-identity was an important way in which it could establish a place for itself within the larger Roman empire. O. van Nijf proposes that honorific "inscriptions helped to turn the urban landscape itself into a mnemonic device, a site of civic memory."¹ Audience organization and seating inscriptions could achieve the same result in the theatre, amphitheatre, and stadium.

Reserved seats for Roman senators had been stipulated as necessary by Augustus and the earlier *lex Ursonensis*, and in some cases areas were also reserved for equestrians.² In addition to these mandatory reservations, the main civic elements of eastern towns (the council and tribes as well as usually the ephebes and the council of elders) and western towns (decurions and *Augustales*) were provided with their own areas.³ The specifics of the seating arrangements were, however, the choice of each individual community. Within different venues various individuals, groups, or bodies were granted seats, reflecting both the civic organization of disparate communities and the desires of those in charge of spectator organization. In the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum, for example, members of the military had their own reserved seats. These individuals were not directly involved with the social structure of the civilian community, but were honoured with assigned seats by the ruling body of the settlement, perhaps in return for

¹ van Nijf 2000, 36.

² For seating arrangements in Rome under Augustus see Chapter 1; for the *lex Ursonensis* see Chapter 2.

a service.⁴ In Aquincum, as in Carnuntum, the military and civilian settlements were located in close proximity to one another, and the presence of military personnel in the civilian amphitheatre in Aquincum reflects this geographical reality. In the amphitheatre of Nîmes *nautae* for whom the city was not the main area of activity were granted seats on the podium, an indication of their economic importance to the community.⁵ The examples of such arrangements are numerous. Reserved seats were a privilege, a physical and very public manifestation of the importance of an individual, office, or group to a community. The leading body or bodies of each community were allowed to a large extent to determine to whom this privilege should be dispensed and to shape the display of the micro-society of the audience as they saw fit.

The Foundation of Gaius Vibius Salutaris

The organization of an audience within a spectacular venue represented a specific societal programme that was chosen as appropriate for that particular space, but theatres were also part of the larger social and civic programme of a community. In Roman Ephesus, the components of the local social structure emphasized in the theatre audience were tied to those on display in another very public venue, namely frequent processions for the goddess Artemis that traversed the city. These processions were one of two main elements of a foundation established by Gaius Vibius Salutaris, a Roman citizen, equestrian, and member of the local βουλή.⁶ In 104

³ Chapters 2 and 3.

⁴ 55.10, perhaps also 55.11, .14; see below and Chapter 2.

⁵ 30.3. .4; see Chapter 2.

⁶ *IK* 11.1, 27.14-21. The discussion of the foundation of Vibius Salutaris that follows is based upon

C.E. he created a foundation in honour of the goddess Artemis for which he required the approval not only of the council and assembly of the city but also of the proconsul of Asia and his legate.⁷ This foundation was responsible for distributions of money to specified groups as well as for public processions, and the end result of its creation was that Salutaris dedicated statues, images, and money to certain civic bodies of Ephesian society and to Artemis herself.⁸ The details of the process are significant not only because both the distributions and the processions reveal the ways in which Salutaris, and therefore also the βουλή and assembly of the city whose approval he needed to create the foundation, wished to structure Ephesian society but also because he made use of the theatre in this process.

The lotteries and distributions took place in the temple of Artemis, for the most part on her birthday and therefore coinciding with the annual celebration of her mysteries. They were complex but can be broken down according to the three groups that were the recipients. These were: those who were required to take care of the statues associated with the procession, those who were required to spend their money on rituals during the mysteries, and those who were required to do neither.⁹ It is the third group, those bodies that were required to do nothing in

Rogers (1991a) and the text of the foundation found at *IK* 11.1, 27. Salutaris is only one example of the many eastern individuals of high social standing who provided financial support for their community during the Roman period. As Mitchell (1993, 211) puts it: "Nothing, however, more clearly illustrates the expectation that the rich would redistribute their wealth to the benefit of their cities than the idealized descriptions of honorific inscriptions, which endlessly ring the changes on patriotic zeal, open-handedness, generosity, and public extravagance of magistrates and other benefactors."

⁷ *IK* 11.1, 27.73-83, 132-133, 412-413, 123-126. For the specifics of the creation of the foundation, see Rogers (1991a, 24-30).

⁸ *IK* 11.1, 27.126-128, 139-152.

⁹ *IK* 11.1, 27.66-69, 220-352, 485-553; Rogers (1991a, 39-79) provides a detailed discussion of the

exchange for their monetary distribution and to which over eighty percent of the total endowment was allocated, that reflects the emphasis placed on certain elements of the social structure by Salutaris and the demos of the city.¹⁰ The civic tribes received the largest amount of money followed by the βουλή, the council of elders, and the ephebes.¹¹ Of the six tribes of Ephesus the names of five (the Ephesians, the Karnaeanes, the Teians, the Euonumoi, and the Bembinaeanes) refer back to the Hellenistic founding of the city; the sixth tribe (*Sebaste*) was named either during or shortly after the time of Augustus. The financial privilege – almost twice as much money as the next highest-paid group, the council – accorded to the fifteen hundred members of the civic tribes by Salutaris suggests a reaffirmation of the Hellenic character of the city, a theme echoed in the procession.¹²

The four-hundred and fifty members of the βουλή and the three-hundred and fourteen members of the γερουσία, next on the list of distributions, were prominent and wealthy men of Ephesus. Their appearance in second place serves to emphasize the privilege of being placed first on the list that was granted to the members of the tribes. The final group to receive any significant amount of money (about seven percent of the total) from the foundation was the youth of the city, forty-nine *paidai* and two hundred and fifty ephebes. The ephebes were the important age group here. As a whole they received more than ninety percent of the funds allocated to the

distributions.

¹⁰ Rogers 1991a, 51.

¹¹ *IK* 11.1, 27; βουλή: 220-231; *gerousia*: 231-238; tribes: 246-252; ephebes: 253-258. See Rogers 1991a, 50, Table 4.

¹² Rogers 1991a, 60, 66.

youth and individually they received larger amounts than the *paides*; they also played an important role in the processions (below). *Paides* do not appear in the processions and another group of young men, the *véoi*, are found neither in the list of distributions nor in the processions.¹³ G. Rogers suggests that the emphasis placed on the ephebes of city by the foundation indicates that the rituals and distributions it created were meant “primarily as a tool of social, political, and even religious acculturation” for these young men.¹⁴

The distributions were performed in the temple of Artemis during the celebration of her mysteries in which the whole city was involved, actively integrating the ephebes into the social fabric of Ephesus. This process was strengthened by their inclusion and standing in the distributions which emphasized the tribes, council, and council of elders of the city, the bodies into which the ephebes would enter as they became adults and aged.¹⁵ Women were included neither in the list of distributions nor in the processions and the only woman mentioned in the text of the foundation is the priestess of Artemis, responsible for distributing money to the hymn-

¹³ Although the *véoi* most likely received other distributions throughout the year and may not have depended financially upon Salutaris' foundation, the members of the council and of the *γεπουσία* were also given other endowments but were still included by Salutaris. Rogers (1991a, 69) suggests that the lack of funding for the *véoi* may have something to do with their involvement in the celebration of the mysteries of Artemis (Strabo 14.1.20). Although *νεώτεροι* and *véoi* can be used interchangeably to describe the age group older than the ephebes, they can also be used as equivalents to ephebes and *véoi* is often used for any group of young men (Forbes 1933, 60-61). In Ephesus the *véoi* were a distinct body from the ephebes.

¹⁴ Rogers 1991a, 67.

¹⁵ Rogers 1991a, 68. Distributions according to civic body were found throughout the empire, such as in Aphrodisias where Tiberius Claudius Ktesias and his family established a fund for distributions and crownings for the *βουλή*, *demos*, tribes, and *proklero*i (MAMA 8, 497.5-8). Bailey (2002, 113) suggests that the *proklero*i were specific members of the local community who had been selected by the benefactor. Distributions in the western empire, which often took place in the local theatre, could also be based upon membership in a civic body, generally the *ordines decurionum* and *Augustalium* (for example CIL IX 23, X 415, 1881). For the place of *collegia* in public banquets and distributions see van Nijf (1997, 149-188).

singers.¹⁶ This indicates their low priority in the hierarchy of Ephesian society as it was structured by Salutaris, the council, and the assembly. Also lacking in the text of the foundation is any mention of professional *collegia*. Although these guilds, such as those of the silver-smiths or of the bread-bakers, existed in Ephesus and played an important role in the local economy, their members were of a lower social standing and were not considered appropriate for inclusion in the model of Ephesian society that Salutaris designed to educate the youth of the city.¹⁷

The foundation of Salutaris and the theatre of Ephesus were related in two ways. The first was through the prominent display of two copies of the decree of the council and demos of Ephesus ratifying the foundation, the location of which Salutaris chose himself.¹⁸ One of these texts was installed in the Artemision, the complex for Artemis, and the other on the wall of the south orchestral entrance (*parodos*) of the theatre. The majority of the text in the theatre would have been above the eye level of anyone standing beneath it and the letters were small enough (one to four centimetres) that the five-hundred and sixty-eight lines of text, arranged in six

¹⁶ *IK* 11.1, 27. 265-268; for the *hymnodoi* see van Nijf (1997, 165-168).

¹⁷ Rogers 1991a, 72. The silver-smiths of Ephesus were involved in demonstrations against Paul the Apostle (*Act. Ap.* 19.23-41) and the bread-bakers held a strike for which they were strongly rebuked (*IK* 11.2, 215). An example of the negative attitude of the elite of Ephesus toward members of *collegia* can be found in a letter from Hadrian to the magistrates and council of Ephesus. In this missive he offers to pay the *summa honoraria* required for entrance into the council on behalf of Lucius Erastus, an individual who was a ship-owner (*naukleros*) and transported dignitaries including Hadrian himself (*SIG*³ 838). The emperor's intervention suggests that the Ephesian council was unwilling to have Erastus as a member and this unwillingness can be attributed to his occupation (Pleket 1983, 134). Pleket (1983, 134) knows of only one case in which an individual is identified as both a councillor and a *naukleros*, a Telesphorus whose sarcophagus was found in Nicomedia (*SEG* XXVII 828). It may have been more common to find merchants as members of the council (Pleket 1983, 139-142); see van Nijf (1997, 22).

¹⁸ *IK* 11.1, 27.123-126.

columns, could not easily be read from below.¹⁹ In combination with its location on the *parodos* wall these factors emphasize that the purpose of the placement of the text in the theatre was not so that it could be read in detail by audience members. Its desired impact did not in fact require it to be read. The theatre was a venue in which large groups of the Ephesian population gathered to watch spectacles, to carry out rituals, and to have public meetings and the size of the inscription ensured that even if it could not be read, it would be visible to those using the theatre. As well, the events that would take place in this venue were those that were funded by the foundation, and the official inscription formalizing the creation of this foundation was therefore perfectly located to reinforce Salutaris' role in providing these civic rituals.²⁰

The second way in which the theatre and the foundation were closely connected is through the processions in honour of Artemis. It was not an official civic procession, no ritual acts took place during its enactment, and it was not part of a major religious festival of the city.²¹ Although it was a procession designed by an individual, it still had to be approved, as did the distributions, by the assembly and council of Ephesus. This procession was to be held for "the first new moon's sacrifice of the archieratic year, and on the occasions of the twelve sacred gatherings and regular assemblies every month, and during the Sebasteia and the Soteria and the penteteric festivals" as well as during athletic festivals and any other days agreed upon by the

¹⁹ Rogers 1991a, 20-21.

²⁰ Rogers 1991a, 22. The function of the inscription as a public display of Salutaris' generosity is recognized by the proconsul of Asia (*IK* 11.1, 27.368).

²¹ Rogers 1991a, 80-81, 83; see Rogers (1991a, 80-126) for a detailed study of the participants, statuary, and route of the procession. For the importance of processions in structuring a community's social

council and demos of the city.²² This means that it most likely took place once every two weeks.²³ It began at the temple of Artemis outside the *temenos*, entered the city through the Magnesian Gate in the south, wound through the city stopping at the theatre, and exited through the Koressian Gate in the north on the return journey to the temple. Within the city itself the epebes were responsible for escorting the procession and its statues into the theatre.²⁴ Nine statues of Artemis, one of which was gold and the rest silver, and twenty silver images, some of which represented the Roman involvement in the city and others of which related to its Greek heritage, were carried by the participants in the procession.²⁵ The gold statue of Artemis was carried at the very front of the procession and the rest of her statues were scattered throughout. The Roman images were the first to follow the gold statue of the goddess. Silver images of Trajan and Plotina were meant to stand in place of the actual physical presence of the emperor and his wife. Next came a silver image of the Roman senate, a physical representation of the power of the Roman political and legal system, followed by the silver image of the βουλή of Ephesus, the local counterpart to the Roman senate.²⁶

hierarchy see van Nijf (1997, 205-206).

²² *IK* 11.1, 27.51-56, 202-204, 213-214, 419-421, 469, 475-477, 553-560; translation Rogers (1991a).

²³ Rogers 1991a, 83.

²⁴ *IK* 11.1, 27.49-56, 91-92, 210-213, 270-273, 423-425, 554-568.

²⁵ *IK* 11.1, 27.22-31, 148-150. It was the potential disruption of their trade in creating these silver statues of Artemis for visitors to Ephesus that caused the silver-smiths of the city to react so strongly to the teachings of Paul the Apostle (*Act. Ap.* 19.23-41). Ephesian Artemis, identifiable by her distinctive iconography (outstretched hands, multiple “breasts”, frontal pose, and the animals that decorate her body) appears in the theatre reliefs at Hierapolis (below).

²⁶ Although there was a cult of the senate in the Roman East, the evidence, the majority of which comes from Asia Minor, indicates that it did not appear until the Imperial period. Erskine (1997, 25, 31-34)

A silver image of the Roman demos came next, followed by that of the council of elders of Ephesus, then by the image of the *ordo equester* which was presumably meant to call to mind Salutaris' status as an *eques* as well as perhaps the influence of this order in the city. A silver image of Augustus followed, accompanied by that of the tribe *Sebaste*, the only tribe whose name reveals Roman influence at the time of the establishment of the foundation.²⁷ The placement of this image before those of the older Greek tribes of Ephesus is striking; the tribe *Sebaste* had only recently, in the mid-first century C.E., become the second tribe in order of prominence while that of the Ephesians was first and dated to the foundation of the city.²⁸ The emphasis placed upon the Roman tribe in the procession echoes that placed upon the Roman images as a whole. The arrangement of these images at the head of the procession combined with the Roman nature of the first area through which it passed, the Upper Agora, was an impressive visual reminder of Roman influence in Ephesus.²⁹ The rest of the statues were, except for one, reminders of the Greek nature of the city. Listed here in no particular order, these images were of the five remaining tribes, the demos of Ephesus, Androklos (the mythical founder

suggests that such a cult did not exist during the Republic because cities in the East could not find a civic body in their own communities comparable to the senate, a process which was necessary in order to make Roman culture intelligible and therefore available for worship. One example of this would be the cult of the Roman demos; all eastern cities had a demos and while its role in society was different from that of the people of Rome, it was seen as an equivalent civic body. It was not until the eastern councils began to increase in power and membership became permanent (see Chapter 3) and the Roman senate's function changed under the emperor that the local councils and the senate could be seen as similar institutions and its worship was established; see also Price (1984, 42); Ando (2000, 168).

²⁷ The tribes Ἀδριανή and Ἀντωνεινιανή were created later; see Jones (1987, 311-315).

²⁸ A list of *neopoioi* from the mid-first century C.E. gives the tribes in order: Ephesians, *Sebaste*, Teians, Karnaeanes, Euonumoi, Bembinaeanes (IK 11.5, 1578a). The *neopoioi* were in charge of inscribing the names of new citizens on the wall of the Artemision (for example IK 11.4 1405.12, 1408.5, 1408.15,

of Ephesus), Euonumos (a mythical figure after whom one of the tribes was named), Lysimachus (the Hellenistic ruler who refounded the city), Pion (a mountain god), Athena, and *Sebaste Homonoia Chrysophoros* (*Concordia Augusta*).³⁰ After the ephebes had escorted the procession into the theatre where it made its only stop, they accompanied it to the Koressian Gate which was a focal point of the Greek foundation legend of the city.³¹ Just as the procession entered into a Roman area of the city led by Roman statues, it exited the city through a Greek area and the last images that were seen were those of the Greek elements of Ephesian society.

The procession was representative, as were the distributions, of Ephesian society as it was visualized by Salutaris, the council, and the assembly.³² Another function of the procession was to call to its spectators' minds the history of the city, first the Roman influence and then, and more importantly, the Hellenic foundation. By recalling the historic Greek elements of the city it offered the citizens of Ephesus a way in which to negotiate Roman rule.³³ Rogers suggests that the primary purpose of the procession, in the same vein as the distributions, was to introduce the ephebes to the history and society of the city as they were presented by Salutaris and the demos.³⁴

The role of the ephebes in escorting the procession throughout Ephesus and into the theatre made them an active part of this re-enactment, of this civic self-representation.

1409.4).

²⁹ Rogers 1991a, 91-95.

³⁰ A complete list of the statues in the procession is provided by Rogers (1991a, 84-85, Table 9).

³¹ Rogers 1991a, 107, 109.

³² For the importance of processions in creating and reinforcing the social hierarchy see van Nijf (1997, 133). He calls (136) civic ceremonies and festivals "joint projects of civic self-representation."

³³ Greek-style agonistic festivals served the same purpose (Chapter 3).

³⁴ Rogers 1991a, 112, 115.

The importance of the theatre to Salutaris' construction of Ephesian society is demonstrated not only by his choice of the venue to carry one of two inscriptions officially confirming the creation of his foundation, but also by the fact that the only stop made by the procession during its progress throughout the city was in this venue.³⁵ The ephebes led the procession into the theatre and the statues and images carried by the participants were placed upon bases. They were to be arranged upon nine inscribed bases in groups of three; these statue bases were located at the top of each *cuneus* in the first *maenianum*.³⁶ Each base carried a bilingual Latin and Greek dedication from Salutaris to Ephesian Artemis and a specific civic group; on the backs of the bases were inscriptions that served as place-markers in the *cavea* for the named civic group. These seating areas were presumably assigned before the erection of the statue bases which served merely to confirm the arrangements. The bases therefore acted not only as resting-places for the statues involved in the procession but also to indicate the groups for whom individual *cunei* were reserved.

The text of the foundation refers explicitly to the placement of the statues above the blocks where different groups were seated.³⁷ One statue base carries a dedication to Ephesian Artemis and the tribe *Sebaste* and the text on the back reserves the area for the tribe; the names of three groups, the νεοποῖοι, individuals in charge of inscribing the names of new citizens on the Artemesion, the χρυσοφόροι, a priestly grouping, and the κούρητες, a priestly grouping

³⁵ *IK* 11.1, 27.49-52, 90-94, 210-213, 268-273, 553-568.

³⁶ *IK* 11.1, 27.202-206.

³⁷ The text (*IK* 11.1, 27) refers to seating areas for the βουλή (157), the priests and sacred victors

originally attached to the Artemision, were added later.³⁸ The dedication states that a silver statue of Artemis, the silver image of Augustus, and the image of the tribe *Sebaste* were to be placed upon this base. A second surviving base is dedicated to Ephesian Artemis and the tribe of the Teians, upon which was to be placed a silver statue of Artemis, the silver image of Lysimachus, and the image of the tribe; this base reserved a *cuneus* for the tribe of the Teians.³⁹ A third base, dedicated to Ephesian Artemis and the tribe of the Karnaeanes, held a silver statue of Artemis, the silver image of the tribe, and perhaps the image of Androklos; the seating block above which it stood was reserved for the tribe of the Karnaeanes.⁴⁰

The dedicatory inscription of a fourth base has been restored to name Ephesian Artemis and the tribe of the Bembinaeanes and the silver statues placed upon it were those of Artemis, the tribe, and perhaps of Pion. It presumably reserved a section for the tribe of the Bembinaeanes, although the text from the back of the base has been lost.⁴¹ Two bases carry dedications to Ephesian Artemis and youth groups of the city. The first, added to the series several years later, is to the *paides* and was designated to hold the silver image of Athena; on the back was an inscription for the tribe Ἀδριανή. This inscription was added to the back of the statue base at a later date since the tribe was not added to the official roster at Ephesus until Hadrian's visit to the

(who were in the "first sector"; 437-442, 476-477), and the *paides* (469).

³⁸ *IK* 11.1, 28; 27.172-177; *IK* 11.6, 2083c; Heberdey 1912, no. 83c.

³⁹ *IK* 11.1, 29; 27.186-189; *IK* 11.6, 2083e; Heberdey 1912, no. 83e.

⁴⁰ *IK* 11.1, 30; 27.182-186; *IK* 11.6, 2083d; Heberdey 1912, no. 83d.

⁴¹ *IK* 11.1, 31; 27.194-197; *IK* 11.6, 2083f. Two other inscriptions for this tribe found in the theatre may be acting as place-markers in the *cavea* (*IK* 11.6, 2084, 2085).

city in 128 or 129 C.E.⁴² The second youth group to whom a base was dedicated was that of the ephebes; it was meant to hold a silver statue of Artemis and the silver images of the equestrian order and of the ephebes. The inscription on the back of the base reserves a *cuneus* of the theatre for the ephebes.⁴³ The dedicatory inscription on the base for the *gerousia* reveals that it held a silver statue of Artemis, the silver statue of the demos of the city of Rome, and the statue of the council of elders; the text reserves an area for the *gerousia*.⁴⁴

Two very fragmentary texts have been found which are thought to have come from the front of one of the series of statue bases, but the group to which they were dedicated cannot be restored.⁴⁵ Four inscriptions, three of which are fragmentary, have been found which come from bases allocated to silver statues of the goddess Artemis; these bases date to 107/108 and 109/110 rather than to 104 C.E.⁴⁶ There are no inscriptions on the backs, suggesting that these bases were not used to indicate an area of reserved seats. The placement of the rest of the statues can be determined from the text of the foundation itself. A silver image of Artemis, the silver image of the demos of Ephesus, and the silver image of the tribe of the Ephesians were to rest on the base dedicated to the tribe of the Ephesians.⁴⁷ On the base dedicated to the council of Ephesus were placed the silver images of Trajan and Plotina, the silver image of the βουλὴ itself, the silver

⁴² *IK* 11.1, 33; 27.465-469; *IK* 11.2, 274; *IK* 11.6, 2083g; Heberdey 1912, no. 83g; Syme 1988, 162.

⁴³ *IK* 11.1, 34; 27.168-172; *IK* 11.6, 2083b; Heberdey 1912, no. 83b.

⁴⁴ *IK* 11.1, 35; 27.164-167; *IK* 11.6, 2083a; Heberdey 1912, no. 83a.

⁴⁵ *IK* 11.1, 32.

⁴⁶ *IK* 11.1, 36.

⁴⁷ *IK* 11.1, 27.177-181.

image of the Roman senate, and the golden statue of Artemis.⁴⁸ Another addition to the series several years later, along with the base dedicated to the *paides*, was that dedicated to Ephesian Artemis, a priestly grouping, and the sacred victors; these two groups as a single unit requested seats in the “first sector” (presumably the first *cuneus*, although whether from the north or south is unclear).⁴⁹ This base, carrying the statue of *Sebaste Homonoia Chrysophoros*, was placed near the first seating block and was granted by the βουλή in response to the request.

Using the arrangement of those statue bases found *in situ* and their accompanying inscriptions reserving sections of the theatre, R. Heberdey proposes a seating plan for the lower *maenianum* of the theatre of Ephesus, which contained eleven *cunei*.⁵⁰ He assigns the council to the central *cuneus*, immediately to its left (the north) were seated the members of the council of elders, and to the right of the central *cuneus* were seated the ephebes; he suggests that both the ephebes and the *gerousia* would have shared their *cunei* with civic officials. Beginning in the second *cuneus* from the south he places the six tribes in their official order as of 104 C.E., the first of which was the tribe of the Ephesians, followed by that of the tribe *Sebaste* and so on.⁵¹ The three central *cunei*, already occupied, are not included in this count. The two outer *cunei* were assigned to the priests and sacred victors, who were given the “first” *cuneus* although

⁴⁸ *IK* 11.1, 27.150-164.

⁴⁹ *IK* 11.1, 27.470-477. See Rogers (1991a, 56-57) for a discussion of the nature of these two groups; also Chapter 3. This *cuneus* may later have been shared with, or given in its entirety to, the tribe *Antoneiniane* (below).

⁵⁰ Heberdey et al. 1912, 202-203; also Chapter 3. For the possible organization of the spectators in the two upper *maeniana* see below.

⁵¹ For the official order of the tribes of Ephesus at this date *supra* n. 28.

whether to the north or south is unclear, and to the *paides*. Since the back of the statue base for the *paides* was later inscribed for the tribe *Hadriane*, it can be assumed that the members of this tribe were given this *cuneus* either in its entirety or to share with the young men; it is likely that, with the later addition of the tribe *Antoneiniane*, the *cuneus* of the priests and sacred victors was shared or reassigned as well. Also at a later date the names of three associations were added to the base for the tribe *Sebaste*, perhaps indicating that they, or at least representatives of these groups, were also seated in this *cuneus*.⁵² Any visiting officials might have been given seats in the orchestra or perhaps would have been seated at the front of the central *cuneus* allocated to the council.

The statue bases of Salutaris' foundation are in fact more useful than most seating inscriptions in terms of providing a snapshot of audience arrangements since they are all dated to 104 C.E. or shortly after. The structuring of Ephesian society according to the wishes of Salutaris and, it must be remembered, the demos of the city that was on display in the processions and in the distributions was also on display in the *ima cavea* of the theatre.⁵³ The inclusion of the theatre as the only stop made by the participants in the procession indicates that Salutaris was aware of its function as a venue in which society as he structured it could be presented to a large group of people simultaneously. The procession was a frequent, mobile, visual reminder to its spectators of the Greek history, Roman present, and idealized social structure of the city. The

⁵² Heberdey 1912, no. 83c, 202-203.

⁵³ "The social, historical, and theological discrimination at the very heart of the foundation ultimately represented the attitudes of the demos of Ephesos (Rogers 1991a, 29)."

organization of the audience in the theatre served the same function, but this display was instead a static one, visually accessible to a greater number of people at the same time. It was the presence of a large portion of the local population as well as any visitors that made theatres, amphitheatres, and stadia such effective locations for exhibiting the structured society that those in charge of the arrangements, be it the local council and assembly in the East or the decurions in the West, wished to display. In these venues all in attendance could look around them and determine their own positions in the approved community on display as well as their place within the empire as a whole.⁵⁴

The presentation of society in a procession designed to create or reinforce a local identity and the relationship of this procession to the theatre is not unique to the foundation of Salutaris. Under Hadrian in the Lycian city of Oenoanda a local citizen and member of the equestrian order (like Salutaris), Gaius Iulius Demosthenes, founded a penteteric agonistic festival involving both musical and athletic events. The details of this festival are recorded in an inscription one hundred and seventy-seven lines long.⁵⁵ As was required for the foundation of Salutaris, the council and assembly of Oenoanda approved Demosthenes' establishment of the festival, although only after a year of negotiation. The need for their approval is made clear in a letter from Hadrian recommending the festival which is addressed not to Demosthenes himself but to the council and

⁵⁴ See Newby (2003) for the role of art in theatres in Asia Minor in negotiating Roman rule.

⁵⁵ *SEG* 28 1462; for more on this festival see Chapter 3. Most festivals established in the East during Roman rule were purely athletic, and Mitchell (1993, 220) suggests that the emphasis of Demosthenes' festival on both musical and athletic events reflects the tastes of the emperor Hadrian.

assembly of the city.⁵⁶ On each day of the festival a procession was to make its way to the theatre and its participants were to perform sacrifices. Images of the god Apollo and of the emperors were to be carried by ten *sebastophoroi* and they were to be escorted by twenty *magistophoroi* who were also in charge of order in the theatre.⁵⁷ The other participants in the procession comprised the agonothele, elected yearly to oversee the organization of the festival, the priest and priestess of the civic imperial cult, the priest of Zeus, three *panegyriarchs* (the presidents of the assembly), the secretary of the council, five *prytaneis*, two market supervisors, two gymnasiarchs, four treasurers, two *paraphylakes* (police officers), the leader of the ephebes, the *paidonomos* (supervisor of education for the city), and the supervisor of public buildings. Also marching in the procession were representatives from the nearby villages.⁵⁸ The only mention of seating arrangements in this inscription is for the agonothele, who was to be granted a front seat at meetings of the council and the assembly and at shows; former agonotheles were to continue to have the same privilege after their tenure of office had ended.⁵⁹ Although the elements of Oenoandan society on parade were very different from those in the Ephesian procession, a similar desire to display publicly a particular representation of society, one aspect of which was

⁵⁶ ll 2-3.

⁵⁷ ll 61-64; see Chapter 2 for *magistophoroi* and *dissignatores*.

⁵⁸ ll 69-80. Rogers (1991b, with conclusions on 99) suggests that since the inhabitants of nearby non-Greek villages and the high priest and priestess were not in the version of the procession originally proposed by Demosthenes, their inclusion only after a year of negotiation indicates that the festival was to originally have been purely Greek in nature. He believes that the presence of these non-Greek elements within this festival would have provided the inhabitants of Oeonanda with a fashion in which to identify, and perhaps resolve, the tension not only between the imperial power and their city but also between the city and the native villages that surrounded it.

⁵⁹ ll 58-59.

the interaction between the community and Roman power, and the relationship between this display and the theatre is clear.⁶⁰

The Different Functions of Spectacular Venues

The text of Salutaris' foundation reveals that the statues and images involved in the procession were to be carried into the theatre for "the first new moon's sacrifice of the archieratic year, and on the occasions of the twelve sacred gatherings and regular assemblies every month, and during the Sebasteia and the Soteria and the penteteric festivals" as well as during athletic festivals and any other days agreed upon by the demos of the city.⁶¹ This varied function of a venue, for both political and entertainment purposes, was common and is attested, for example, by seating inscriptions in the odeon of Aphrodisias.⁶² Odea were designed for musical or small-scale theatrical presentations but meetings of the assembly sometimes took place within them, and the overlap between these two functions is the same as that found within theatres.⁶³ Seating inscriptions from certain odea indicate that the organization, or at least identification, of those in attendance (whether for entertainment or political meetings) was a concern. The odeon of Aphrodisias seems to have served not only as a location for concerts and recitals but also as a meeting place for civic groups; one set of inscriptions in particular may reflect this political

⁶⁰ van Nijf 1997, 194. Processions into spectacular venues were an integral part of the imperial cult (below).

⁶¹ *IK* 11.1, 27.51-56, 202-204, 213-214, 419-421, 469, 475-477, 553-560; translation Rogers (1991a).

⁶² Roueché 1993, 118; 66.

⁶³ See Sear (2006, 39-40) for a discussion of odea.

function. A series of groups of letters was inscribed on the front lip of certain seats and these abbreviations most likely represented local civic bodies.⁶⁴ These texts are only found in a certain area of the *cavea* in which the front lips of the seats have survived but they might have occurred elsewhere as well. Other inscriptions from this edifice are more appropriate for its use as a concert hall. The local νεοτέροι (association of younger men) were given their own area and, of the four other surviving inscriptions from the odeon, three are factional.⁶⁵ One of these factional inscriptions, all of which are in support of the Blues, refers to the elder Jews as Blues; the fourth, non-factional text reserves seats for Jews.⁶⁶ These inscriptions are more appropriate for gatherings meant for entertainment than for meetings for political purposes.⁶⁷ Although the factional inscriptions may be later in date than the other texts, there is no reason why the odeon of Aphrodisias could not have been used on a regular basis as a venue for both political meetings and for entertainment.

While the edifice in Aphrodisias has been identified as an odeon, it is in some cases difficult to determine whether a structure should be considered an odeon or a bouleterion. Bouleteria were constructed to house political meetings, but the seating inscriptions in the venues of Gerasa (below) and of Aphrodisias, both of which are generally identified as odea, suggest that odea could be used for the same purpose.⁶⁸ There are several criteria that can be used, most

⁶⁴ 66.1; Roueché 1993, 117-118.

⁶⁵ 66.2; 66.4, .5, .6.

⁶⁶ 66.4; 66.3.

⁶⁷ The presence of Jews as easily identifiable groups in audiences is discussed in Chapter 3.

⁶⁸ Balty has in fact identified both these venues, as well as the small theatre or odeon of Alexandria,

effectively in combination, to distinguish odeia and bouleteria.⁶⁹ Size is the first, with bouleteria generally assumed to be the smaller venues, but this is not always a decisive means of distinction; directly related to size is the capacity of the venue, since bouleteria were designed to hold only a specific segment of the population. Proximity to the community's *agora*, the presence of an altar in the middle of the orchestra, the lack of a stage, and two (rather than three as were usually found in odeia) doorways from the outside are indicative of a bouleterion; the presence of tribunalia and an elaborate *scaenae frons* suggests instead an odeon.⁷⁰

Since there was a tradition in some areas of the East of using theatres to house political meetings, the presence of tribal seating inscriptions in these venues under the Romans can suggest, with some limitations, that a particular theatre was used for meetings of the assembly as well as for entertainment.⁷¹ J. Wiseman argues that it would have been unnecessary to assign civic tribes their own areas at spectacular events since the entire population of the city as well as outsiders were allowed to be present, making the division of audience members by tribe of little

as bouleteria (1983, 515-519, 534-538, 541-545). In his comprehensive survey of Roman theatres, Sear (2006, 299), however, suggests that the venue of Alexandria is an odeon but cites Balty's assertion that it is a bouleterion, and lists (312, 329-330) the venues of Gerasa and Aphrodisias as odeia.

⁶⁹ This list has been adapted from Sear (2006, 38-39).

⁷⁰ See Sear (2006, 40) for a discussion of bouleteria. A venue in the temple sanctuary of Artemis in Dura Europus that was originally identified by Cumont (1926, 186-188) as an odeon was determined to be a bouleterion by the discovery of a seating inscription for a Ζώιλος Ζαβδός βουλευτῆς Δούρας (Baur 1933, 170-171, nos. 343-344) and of a statue located within this building dedicated to Julia Domna by the council of Dura (Balty 1983, 505). Other seating inscriptions were previously found in the venue, but contained only single names and thus did nothing to clarify its function (Cumont 1926, 445-446, nos. 125-127). Before the discovery of the statue and of the seating inscription mentioning the council, it seemed likely that the venue was a private odeon serving initiates of the cult of Artemis, as was the case in Altbachtal, Contiomagus, and Vienna (below). It is now clear that although this edifice is located within a temple sanctuary it functioned as a bouleterion for the community of Dura Europus as a whole; see also Balty (1983, 503-507).

⁷¹ Sear 2006, 41; see Chapter 3 for the reflection in tribal names of the transition between the

use.⁷² There is, however, an arrangement supported by the text of Salutaris' foundation that would accommodate both the division of the local citizens into tribes and the seating of other members of the local population and visitors (below). Wiseman is referring to the theatre of Stobi in particular, on whose seats were inscribed not only the names of tribes but also of individuals who were members of these tribes.⁷³ This venue was from the beginning designed to serve multiple functions, meetings of the assembly and stage entertainment as well as the presentation of *munera* and *venationes*, since the *cavea* does not extend all the way to the orchestra but is raised on a podium, similar to the design of an amphitheatre.⁷⁴

The mere presence of a few inscriptions reserving seats for tribes, however, is not enough to indicate that the venue in question was used for meetings of the assembly. In order for a theatre or odeon to have been used for such meetings, each civic tribe would have required enough space to accommodate its members, or at least enough of its members to reach a quorum. This arrangement seems to be in place in Ephesus, Gerasa, Hierapolis, Megalopolis, Nablus, Saittai, and Stobi.⁷⁵ The original function of the odeon of Gerasa, at least as it is indicated by seating inscriptions, appears to have been to house political meetings. Texts reserving areas for tribes and for the city's βουλή are found only in the lower *cavea* (*ima cavea*), built in 165/166 C.E.; the later upper *cavea* (*summa cavea*), perhaps constructed under Severus Alexander (222-

Classical and Hellenistic periods on the one hand and the Principate on the other.

⁷² Wiseman 1984, 578-579.

⁷³ 7, 8.

⁷⁴ Gebhard 1981, 17-18.

⁷⁵ Gerasa: 80; Hierapolis: 75; Megalopolis: 5; Nablus: 78; Saittai: 73; Stobi: 7, 8.

235 C.E.), is devoid of any inscriptions. One quarter of the original *cavea* was assigned to the βουλή while the rest was divided up between the tribes of Gerasa.⁷⁶ The devotion of the entire *ima cavea* to these bodies suggests that before the addition of the *summa cavea* over half a century later the main use of this venue was as a political meeting-place. Although the odeon could also have been used for musical or small-scale theatrical presentations, if the arrangement indicated by the seating inscriptions were in place during these performances there would have been no room for any other audience members. It is the addition of the *summa cavea* that suggests an expansion in the function of the odeon. This new space, increasing the number of individuals who could be present, would not be necessary for political meetings but would allow more members of the local population to attend theatrical or musical presentations. In the stadium of Saittai enough space was assigned to each tribe to accommodate its members, but it is thus far the only evidence for a stadium perhaps being used for meetings of the assembly.⁷⁷ In the stadium of Aphrodisias, on the other hand, three inscriptions may be for tribes but the only one that has been securely identified reserves only one row for what appear to be representatives of the civic tribes.⁷⁸

In all venues in which tribes were granted enough space to allow the venue, if necessary, to function as a meeting place for the assembly, the question of the enforcement of that seating arises. On days when an edifice was used for entertainment purposes rather than for political

⁷⁶ Retzleff and Mjely 2004, 37; see Chapter 3.

⁷⁷ 73.

⁷⁸ 67.3, .34, .55.

meetings, it is difficult to know if tribal seating would still have been in place or if audience members would have taken their seats in a different manner. The text of the foundation of Salutaris supports the continuous application of tribal seating. The placement of the statues on their bases was the same for all occasions which reveals that the seating arrangements were also the same during the different uses of the theatre. Although Wiseman believes that tribal seating would have been unnecessary during spectacular performances since all members of the community could be present (above), the odeon of Gerasa presents a possible alternative scenario. Tribal seating could remain in effect in the lower *cavea*, while the rest of the venue could accommodate other members of the local population as well as visitors. This would in fact be possible in all the theatres with tribal seating inscriptions: Ephesus (the venue had three *maeniana*), Hierapolis (two *maeniana*), Megalopolis (three *maeniana*), Nablus (two *maeniana*), and Stobi (two *maeniana*).⁷⁹

As has been emphasized throughout this study, the audience in attendance at spectacles was not always an exact static replica of the social and civic structure of a community. This was not only due to the desire of those in charge to present an idealized depiction of local society, but also because certain venues had a function other than, or as well as, a building of entertainment for the local population. The dual settlements of Aquincum and Carnuntum each had two amphitheatres, one civilian and one military. The original military venue in each community was constructed in wood during the Julio-Claudian period and then later rebuilt in stone. The civilian

⁷⁹ These theatres are summarized in Sear (2006): Ephesus (334-336), Hierapolis (338-339),

amphitheatre of Aquincum was constructed under Trajan when the settlement was given the status of *municipium*, and that of Carnuntum under Hadrian to celebrate the same elevation of status.⁸⁰ The function of military amphitheatres seems to have been dual, for both training purposes and entertainment. These two uses could be combined so that soldiers using gladiatorial combat as training for engagement could be viewed by spectators in the *cavea*.⁸¹ Since military amphitheatres tended to be constructed on the *limes* of the empire, they would also have played a role in introducing Roman culture to the local inhabitants and in reinforcing for military personnel the consequences of challenging Roman supremacy.⁸²

Inscriptions from the amphitheatres in Aquincum and Carnuntum reveal that the spectators in the two settlements were not distinct groups: military personnel did not remain only in the military amphitheatres, nor civilians in the civilian amphitheatres. In Carnuntum civilian magistrates, the *quattuorviri*, were given reserved seats in one of the *tribunalia* of the military venue.⁸³ These seats may have been given to the magistrates as a gesture of goodwill on the part of the military settlement.⁸⁴ The reservation of seats for these civilians in the military amphitheatre may indicate that something other than training was taking place in the military arena. It seems unlikely that reserved seats would have been assigned during training bouts at all.

Megalopolis (400-401), Nablus (305), Stobi (419).

⁸⁰ Kolendo (1979) provides a useful discussion of all four venues; also Golvin (1988, 122-125).

⁸¹ Bateman (1997, 80-82) provides a useful summary of the debate surrounding the primary function of military amphitheatres. See Welch (1994, 63-65) for the use of gladiatorial training in the Republican army.

⁸² Futrell 2000, 61, 66, 150-152.

⁸³ 56.

⁸⁴ Kolendo 1981, 312.

let alone for non-military individuals. The presence of seats reserved for these magistrates suggests instead that gladiatorial presentations of some sort, whether using soldiers in training or prisoners of war, were taking place at which the *quattuorviri* were given seats of honour opposite the legate of the legion.⁸⁵

The evidence is reversed in Aquincum where military personnel, the *carcerarius legionis* (military jailer) and at least one *veteranus*, were given their own seats in the civilian venue.⁸⁶ The *carcerarius* might have been given his seat in exchange for the provision of prisoners for gladiatorial performances; similarly, the *veteranus* might also have performed some service for the civilian community.⁸⁷ Unfortunately no inscriptions survive from the amphitheatre of the military settlement. Although the inscriptions from the civilian amphitheatre of Aquincum do not suggest a dual function for this venue, along with the texts from the military amphitheatre of Carnuntum they reveal that the venues of one settlement were not completely inaccessible to members of the other settlement. This is particularly noteworthy since in both Aquincum and Carnuntum the military and civil amphitheatres were built at the far ends of both settlements rather than in between them, indicating that in their original conception they were each to serve a distinct population. The civilian amphitheatres of both Aquincum and Carnuntum, constructed later than the original military amphitheatres, represent an effort on the part of the civilian

⁸⁵ Futrell 2000, 151.

⁸⁶ 55.10, .11.

⁸⁷ Kolendo 1979, 52 n. 89; 1981, 314.

communities to claim a venue of their own.⁸⁸ The inscriptions reserving seats for military personnel in the civilian amphitheatre and civilian magistrates in the military amphitheatre demonstrate that the two settlements, located in close proximity to one another, interacted. The reservation of seats for individuals from outside of the individual civilian or military settlement reveals the presence of individuals from a discrete community.

The Religious Character of Spectacular Venues

Since the societal programme on display in spectacular venues was a reflection both of elements of the actual social structure of a community and of the specific desires and ideologies of the local elite, audience organization was a way in which the disparate social and civic structures of individual communities were made manifest. The surviving seating inscriptions from the stadium of Didyma, for example, reflect the religious character of the site. The site of Didyma is located 16 kilometres south of Miletus and was focussed on its famous oracular shrine of Apollo which was established in the Archaic period.⁸⁹ The stadium of the site was most likely constructed in the early second century B.C.E. and was essentially an extension of the temple of Apollo, in that the south steps of the temple served as seats for the stadium; seating for the other side of the stadium was built independently.⁹⁰ Many texts from the seats of the stadium mention the *prophetai*, the priests of the shrine of Apollo, elected annually from the leading families of

⁸⁸ Kolendo 1979, 52-53.

⁸⁹ For the oracle of Apollo at Didyma during the Greek and Roman periods, see for example Parke (1986); Fontenrose (1988); Hammond (1998).

⁹⁰ Fontenrose 1988, 19-20; he suggests (42) that there may have been seven rows of seats on each

nearby Miletus. The importance of this office is reflected in its use to make official the allocation of certain seats; the name of the individual to whom the seat was granted is accompanied by that of the *prophetes*.⁹¹ The seating inscriptions from Didyma neatly reflect the function of the site as an oracular temple and also confirm the importance of the office of *prophetes* to the community.

A significant number of the surviving seating inscriptions in the theatre of Dionysus in Athens also reserve places for religious personnel, including those holding offices of the imperial cult. This reflects the traditional religious nature of the theatre as well as its Roman function as a venue in which gladiatorial presentations for the imperial cult were held.⁹² Unlike other theatres such as those of Pompeii, Syracuse, and Termessus, that of Dionysus in Athens was not modified under the Romans to better suit a hierarchically organized society.⁹³ This lack of correlation between the architectural design of the *cavea* and the existing societal structure can be attributed to the social programme which the Athenians had chosen as appropriate for the theatre. Although seats were now identified as reserved not only for the holders of religious office but also in some cases for specific individuals, D.B. Small suggests that the programme of the theatre continued to be one of public assembly, where despite the strictly differentiated actual social structure the architecture remained that of a venue originally designed to display an egalitarian ideology.⁹⁴ The *cavea* of the theatre of Dionysus provides an excellent visual example of the co-

side of the stadium. For architectural specifics of the surviving stadium see Rehm (1958, 140-141).

⁹¹ Rehm 1958, 102; Parke 1986, 124; see Chapter 3.

⁹² Spawforth 1997, 184.

⁹³ See Chapters 2 and Chapter 3.

⁹⁴ Small 1987, 87-88.

existence of traditional Greek civic institutions with Roman ones.⁹⁵

In two particular venues, even though the tenure of a religious office is not indicated in any of the seating inscriptions, the community reflected is a religious one. Temples to deities in the Graeco-Roman world generally did not stand alone but existed within a larger sanctuary complex. Many temple sanctuaries contained theatres and since these venues were located within the complex walls the spectators would have been initiates of the cult.⁹⁶ Since the deities worshipped in these, sometimes rural, sanctuaries could be of a local character or be local deities that were amalgamated with Roman ones, the individuals in attendance could be representative of the native population of the community. Seating inscriptions in these venues, therefore, may be able to better reflect both local character as well as Roman influence since the initiates of the cult would be a cross-section of the community. In theatres and other venues not located within a temple complex, on the other hand, individuals given the honour of a reserved seat by a seating inscription were usually of a higher social status in the community at large.

In the theatre of Altbachtal located in a cult complex near Trier in Germany, constructed circa 100 C.E., the names of individuals were inscribed on the seats they occupied.⁹⁷ The location of this theatre within the sanctuary, its alignment with a shrine consecrated to Hecate and two unknown goddesses (perhaps Epona and Minerva), its high walls, and the discovery of

⁹⁵ See Chapter 3.

⁹⁶ Sear 2006, 45. An exception to this arrangement is found in the temple complex of Artemis at Dura Europus, in which a bouleterion designed to serve the community as a whole, not only the religious initiates, was located (*supra* n. 70).

⁹⁷ 41.

theatrical masks within the venue all indicate that it was a private theatre reserved for initiates of the cult.⁹⁸ These initiates would have participated in cult games and festivals held in the theatre. Although many of the inscriptions are fragmentary, it is clear that both native and Roman names are found on the seats, although an individual with the *tria nomina* is found only once. While the frequency of Roman and native names are approximately equal, the native naming practice (a single name followed by that of the father in the genitive) predominates. Combinations of a native and Roman name also occur.⁹⁹ When a seat was reassigned to another individual, the original names were either carved over or the seat was turned around so that the original back end of the block faced the front. This was possible because each seat was not curved to fit in the semicircular *cavea*, as were most seats in theatrical venues, but were individual blocks with four straight sides.¹⁰⁰ A cult theatre is thought to have existed in rural Contiomagus (Pachten, Germany) because blocks from the sanctuary, including an honorary inscription with a relief and stones identified as seats inscribed with names, were found in the wall of a nearby castle.¹⁰¹ The deity worshipped in this sanctuary was the Celtic river goddess Pritona, known also as Ritona and Ritonina, whose name has been found at Altbachtal as well.¹⁰² The inscriptions in this theatre consist of names which are largely native in origin.

Both the sanctuary of Altbachtal and that of Contiomagus were outside of the urbanized

⁹⁸ Binsfeld 1967, 101; Bouley 1983, 566-568 and figs. 3, 15, 16.

⁹⁹ Binsfeld 1967, 108-109.

¹⁰⁰ Binsfeld 1967, 101.

¹⁰¹ 40; also Moreau (1956-1958).

¹⁰² Moreau 1956-1958, 117, 119; Binsfeld 1967, 102.

centre of the nearby city and therefore the appearance of native names in inscriptions is not a surprise. The sanctuary at Contiomagus was more rural, however, and this is reflected in the mostly native names found in the seating inscriptions in its theatre as opposed to the more common Roman elements in names from the theatre of Altbachtal. The frequency of Roman names in Altbachtal does not reflect an actual increased Roman population in this area compared to that in Contiomagus, but rather increased Roman influence that resulted in a preference for Roman names, a practice common in the second century C.E.¹⁰³

In a sacred theatre in Vienna dating to the Julio-Claudian period an inscription mentions a *locus* reserved for members of the priesthood of the *dendrophoroi*. This theatre was used for worship of Cybele and was surrounded by high walls to protect it from the gaze of those who were not initiates.¹⁰⁴ Seating inscriptions and seat reservations were not limited only to theatres in temple complexes; they were also used to reserve seats in a different type of venue in the temple precinct of Artemis, located within the city walls of Dura Europus in Syria. Although not a theatre nor any other traditional spectacular venue, an area was established within this sanctuary in which spectators could be seated.¹⁰⁵ Steps were constructed in the temple *pronaos* at the end of the first century B.C.E., turning the area into a small auditorium that would have been used for religious rites and festivities. The names of both men and women, Greek and Aramean, were

¹⁰³ Binsfeld 1967, 109.

¹⁰⁴ Sear 2006, 4, 45, 253-254. Although he provides *CIL* XII 1929 as a reference, the text as found in that volume, while from Vienna, does not seem to refer to the *dendrophoroi* nor to be reserving an area for them in the sacred theatre.

¹⁰⁵ Cumont 1926, nos. 86-121; Downey 1988, 89-91; *supra* n. 70 for the town's bouleterion.

inscribed on the seats of this room; the texts date to 61-62 C.E. Greek, and in particular Macedonian, names were the most common for the women but several inscriptions suggest families of mixed Greek and Semitic descent.

Changes in Audience Organization

Since audiences in spectacular venues functioned as a reflection of the social and civic structure of the individual community in which they were located, no matter to what extent it was an idealized reflection, changes in audience organization are indicative both of changes in the civic structure and attitudes of the community and of changes in the overarching ideology of the time. Evidence of the transition from Hellenic to Roman domination in the East, as found in the breakdown of the egalitarian ideology of the theatrical audience, is provided by the increased number of seats allocated to individuals and also by the presence of *collegia* in the audience.¹⁰⁶ Changes in community structure during the Roman period are also reflected in seating inscriptions. In the most basic sense the recutting of inscriptions on seats indicates that the occupant changed over time. This could be especially problematic when a seat was allocated to a specific individual rather than to a specific office; communities could avoid this by having only the name of the office inscribed rather than the name of the office and its holder, or by having the relevant information painted on the seats rather than inscribed.¹⁰⁷ The recutting of inscriptions

¹⁰⁶ The attribution of Roman names to Greek tribes is also evidence of Roman rule in the East; these and other effects of the transition as they are reflected in audience organization are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

¹⁰⁷ Many seats in venues throughout the empire show evidence of re-use including those in the

from the theatre seats of Stobi is of particular interest.¹⁰⁸ Both personal names and the names of tribes are carved into the theatre seats and it is possible because of the placement of the inscriptions to assign specific individuals to specific tribes. The theatre would, at least in its earlier stages, have been used both for amphitheatrical and theatrical spectacles and for meetings of the assembly.¹⁰⁹ The seats show evidence of heavy reuse, and many of the earlier personal inscriptions have been overlaid by later ones. New names were still being added in the third century C.E. since at least one text was inscribed around a post-hole that was added in third century renovations after an earthquake.¹¹⁰

This reuse of the seats could be indicative of two things. The first would be that theatre seating was no longer allocated by tribe, perhaps because the venue came to be used primarily for entertainment purposes rather than for meetings of the assembly, and therefore spectators began to be seated with their families.¹¹¹ The second manner in which the recutting of the seats in the theatre of Stobi could be interpreted is that tribal distinctions continued to be relevant but families who were initially members of the tribes ceased to attend meetings of the assembly, perhaps because the family died out or moved away from Stobi. In this case, the area that had previously been assigned to one family would be reassigned to another and the old inscriptions would either

theatre of Aphrodisias (65), the theatre of Stobi (7, 8), and the amphitheatre of Paris (38). For more on the difficulties presented by seating inscriptions and the reuse of seats, see Chapter 2.

¹⁰⁸ 7, 8.

¹⁰⁹ See Chapter 3 and above.

¹¹⁰ Gebhard 1975, 52-53; Wiseman 1984, 581. The function of this post-hole would have been to support a net that protected spectators from the events occurring in the arena.

¹¹¹ Gebhard 1981, 15; see Chapter 3 for the decline of the assembly.

be destroyed or merely carved over.¹¹²

Different evidence for a change in the nature and composition of tribes comes from the odeon of Gerasa and the stadium of Saittai. The presence of seating inscriptions in these two venues for members of the linen-workers (λινούργοι) indicates that *collegia* of individuals of a lower social status were, at least in these two cities, granted seating on par with civic tribes.¹¹³ This increase in status of the λινούργοι over time is demonstrated most clearly in the odeon of Gerasa, where the names of two tribes were almost completely erased in order to make room for these new individuals in the social hierarchy of the audience.¹¹⁴ The seating inscriptions for delegates of the *Tres Galliae* in the amphitheatre of Lyon are also indicative of changes, although not in civic tribes, within the particular community of the venue. The presence of texts reserving space for individuals both from the community of Lyon itself and from outside of the *Tres Galliae* reflects the enlargement of the *cavea* and the decision to open up the festivities to those not involved in the provincial imperial cult (below).

In certain venues the very location of seating inscriptions can provide insight into architectural and societal changes that occurred during the transition between Hellenic and Roman rule or during the Roman period alone. Architectural alterations are, of course, in themselves indicative of changes in society over time, and the renovations carried out in the theatres of Pompeii, Syracuse, and Termessus as well as the lack of renovation to the theatre of

¹¹² Wiseman 1984, 580; see the same work (580-582) for prosopographical discussion of the texts.

¹¹³ See Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion of these inscriptions.

¹¹⁴ 80.11+18.

Dionysus have already been discussed. The dearth of inscriptions in the *summa cavea* of the odeon of Gerasa, while the original *ima cavea* is designated in its entirety to civic tribes and the local council, suggests that a venue used originally only for meetings of the political bodies of the city was then expanded into one which had an increased capacity appropriate for small-scale musical or theatrical presentations. In the stadium of Aphrodisias more inscriptions are found in the eastern end of the *cavea* than in the western, which may partly be because spectators sitting in this section were avoiding having the sun in their eyes during morning performances. It is also in the eastern end, however, that a small arena was built at a later date.¹¹⁵ The high concentration of seating inscriptions in this area suggests that after the construction of the arena the eastern end was the only section in use, and therefore the only area in which texts identifying the occupants of the seats were still being carved.

Individual Identity and Group Membership

Although seats could be assigned in venues in Italy and the provinces on the basis of individual merit, it was much more common that they were granted because of membership in a particular group. That is not to say that seats were not reserved for individuals by name, but rather that many of these seats were inscribed not only with the name of the individual in question but also by his or her title or group affiliation.¹¹⁶ Seats were also reserved as a block for

¹¹⁵ Roueché 1993, 1, 84.

¹¹⁶ When discussing funerary epitaphs, van Nijf (1997, 41) identifies those in which the individual's profession is declared as using "a strategy of distinction" together with "one of integration." This statement is equally applicable to similar inscriptions in spectacular venues.

a particular group as a whole without any indicator of individual identity and for individuals without any indication of office or another form of group affiliation. Declarations of group membership or of individual status or tenure of office were, however, common.

The reservation of a block of seats for specific groups was a common phenomenon and suggests that membership in a group was one of the best ways in which reserved seats could be obtained. For individuals in the lower strata of society who could not afford the public acts of beneficence which might result in the grant of a seat, group membership was perhaps the best way in which to acquire a reserved seat. These groups could be empire-wide as were the senatorial and equestrian orders. As has previously been discussed, the *senatus consultum* passed under Augustus reserving the front row of seats at all shows for senators was meant to be applied throughout the empire.¹¹⁷ Although equestrians as a group were granted seats in the theatres of Mérida and Orange, there is no other evidence for the block assignation of seats to *equites*.¹¹⁸ Members of the *ordo equester* in the provinces were also members of the local elite and thus, if they were not automatically granted a reserved seat because of their equestrian status, they would have received one via another avenue. Groups in which membership could provide a reserved seat could also be limited to the western or eastern empire. Decurions as an *ordo* had their own area in western venues as did the *Augustales* as a group, although it seems that in particular instances individual members of the *Augustales* could be given seats among the local

¹¹⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 44.1.

¹¹⁸ 50, 29.

decurions.¹¹⁹ In the amphitheatre of Lambaesis the Latin equivalent to tribes, *curiae*, were granted block seats; groups of young men, *iuniores* and *iuvenes*, had their own seats in two venues.¹²⁰ In the East the members of the local councils, tribes, and generally the councils of elders and the ephebes were assigned particular sections of the venue.¹²¹ Factional affiliation, the evidence in seating inscriptions for which survives only in the East, could in the later empire provide audience members with a group identity; it seems likely that the seating arrangements for factions evolved out of those already in place for professional *collegia* as well as perhaps for other self-identified groups such as the Jews.¹²² Members of professional *collegia* and the holders of certain offices including priesthoods were granted seats as a block.

Seats assigned to *collegia* were usually located together but in the theatre of Bostra, although the seats for the wine-skin makers were all located in the second *cuneus*, they were not organized in a cohesive whole.¹²³ There does not appear to be any correspondence between the location of seats for similar guilds in different cities, since the decision concerning not only to whom the seats should be granted but also where these seats should be situated in the *cavea* was the choice of each community. While seats for the members of professional *collegia* are found in venues in both the western and eastern areas of the empire, they are much more common in the

¹¹⁹ See Chapter 2. A fragmentary inscription from Epora grants a local *sevir Augustalis* the *ornamenta decurionalia* as well as the right to be seated among the decurions at public meals. It is possible that the missing portion of the inscription following these grants refers to seating at games; suggested restorations are *inter decuriones ludis convenire permisit* and *inter decuriones ludis insertis* but neither can be confirmed (Stylow *ad CIL* II²/7, 139).

¹²⁰ 64; 54.1, 45.10.

¹²¹ There could be local variation in the nomenclature of the ephebes; see Chapter 3.

¹²² See Chapter 3.

East. Membership in a professional association was the best way that an individual of a lower social stratum, one who needed to work for a living, could obtain a reserved seat in a spectacular venue. In both the stadium of Saittai and the odeon of Gerasa the professional association that was granted seats was that of the linen-workers and in these two cities at least it seems as though this particular guild was considered to be on par with the local civic tribes, at least in status if not in political power. Membership in a *collegium* might not always, however, have been a successful route to social recognition. In the text of the foundation of Salutaris, no mention whatsoever is made of seating for members of professional associations. Only those elements of Ephesian society deemed acceptable by Salutaris, an equestrian, and the local council and assembly were included in the distributions and processions, and *collegia* did not fall into this category.

Membership in the *Augustales* served a similar function as that of membership in a professional association. The *Augustales* were not a unified, defined group and its members were scattered throughout cities in Italy and the West.¹²⁴ The majority of *Augustales* were *liberti* and although they could accumulate vast wealth they were not allowed to become members of the upper *ordines* because of their servile birth. Most *Augustales*, therefore, were denied the social and juridical privileges that came with membership in the *ordo senatorius* or the *ordo equester*. By belonging to the *Augustales* a freedman was able to receive certain social

¹²³ 79.5, .9, .11; Chapter 3.

¹²⁴ See Chapter 2.

privileges, one of which was reserved seating in spectacular venues.¹²⁵ *Liberti* could also belong to *collegia*; membership in these groups was not limited only to freeborn individuals. Freedmen, for example, could be *navicularii*, ship-owners; Petronius' Trimalchio is the most famous example. For freed individuals membership in a *collegium* could serve the same purpose as membership in the *Augustales*, to provide a sense of identity and a certain level of social status within a community.¹²⁶

Not only were blocks of seats assigned to certain groups, whether empire-wide, restricted to the Latin or Greek-speaking portions of the empire, or region- or community-specific, but individual seats were reserved by name for some members of these groups. While inclusion in a larger, official, group was an important factor in obtaining reserved seats, individual identification within this larger body distinguished one member from another and was evidence of a more personal privilege. In a wider sense, this applied to the reservation of seats in theatres found in temple sanctuaries such as those of Contiomagus and Althbacthal.¹²⁷ Although any individual allowed to be a spectator in these venues must have been an initiate of the individual cult and therefore already a member of a narrowly-defined portion of the wider population, the declaration of the personal reservation of a seat provided an even more individualized experience. In venues in which more than one group of the population was present, the name of the group to which an individual belonged could be inscribed upon the seat as well as his or her

¹²⁵ Tudor 1962, 205; see Chapter 2.

¹²⁶ Meijer and van Nijf 1992, 75.

¹²⁷ 40, 41.

personal name. In several cases the seat upon which the name of an individual and his group affiliation is identified was found out of context and it therefore cannot be determined if it was originally located within a set block of seats, while in other cases the seats are *in situ* and it seems that they stood alone and were not located in a larger reserved area. Whether or not the original location of these seats is known, the individual identification of a seat by name and affiliation indicates that its occupant was a member of a larger body whose identity he felt it was necessary to declare, even if his seat might have been located in a different area of the *cavea*.

A striking aspect of audience organization at Didyma is that many of the seating inscriptions from the stadium refer to some sort of group affiliation; in most cases the name of the individual for whom the seat was reserved appears to be included. In some inscriptions the name of an office such as agonothete or a priesthood is mentioned along with that of the individual, indicating membership in the civic structure of the community as a whole. Smaller unidentifiable groups are also included, groups that seem to be focussed around particular individuals as is indicated by the use of τῶν περὶ or τρικλινον and its variants in association with a name.¹²⁸ The presence of a large number of inscriptions which mention some type of group affiliation suggests that membership in a larger body, whether through the tenure of office or another type of group identification, was important to audience members and therefore perhaps that it was an important aspect of community life in Didyma outside of the context of the

¹²⁸ Chapter 3.

stadium as well.¹²⁹ Such individual identification within a larger group is not unique to Didyma alone. In the amphitheatre of Carthage several *principales almae Karthaginis* and *viri clarissimi* had seats reserved in their name as well as title.¹³⁰ In the amphitheatre of Syracuse an equestrian who may have been one of the only individuals of this rank, rather than of senatorial rank, sitting on the podium identified himself as such, and in the amphitheatre of Mérida a seat was reserved for a decurion identified by name.¹³¹ On a seat in the theatre of Aphrodisias the leader of the *aurarii* was identified by name while in the stadium of the same city a sculptor was identified by name and occupation.¹³² In the theatre of Laodicea an individual of consular rank was identified by name and title and in the stadium of Didyma a τραγῳδός, perhaps a tragic actor, was listed by name.¹³³

What these inscriptions including both the name and larger group affiliation of the occupant reveal is that although membership in a larger body was important there was also a desire for individual, personal identification within the larger group. Affiliation with a group was one of the ways in which an individual could obtain a seat in a spectacular venue, and the declaration of such an affiliation in a seating inscription not only validated the occupant's claim to a seat but also provided the occupant with an established identity within the community. Membership within a local group, whether occupational, political, or of another type, indicated

¹²⁹ van Nijf 1997, 227-228.

¹³⁰ Chapter 2.

¹³¹ 12.1+2; 49.1a.

¹³² 65.56; 67.14; see Chapter 3 for the *aurarii*.

¹³³ 76; 68.1.23.

that the individual in question belonged to the community as a whole. Such membership could also have wider implications. Group affiliation due to the tenure of office suggests that the individual was a member of the local elite who could afford the necessary public expenditure; membership in the *ordo decurionum* in the West and the local council in the East obviously had the same implication. Identification as an equestrian or senator established the occupant within an empire-wide *ordo* and therefore provided him with a rightful place in the empire as a whole.

In several cases a claim to group affiliation did not indicate that the occupant of the seat was a member of community in which the inscription was found, but instead that he had a valid identity within another community. The reservation of a seat for the *carcerarius legionis* in the civilian amphitheatre at Aquincum conveys that the individual to whom the seat was granted was an outsider, someone who had no membership in the civilian community in which he found himself but did belong to the military community by which he identified himself.¹³⁴ Other instances of such identification include those in which individuals from another community are given reserved seats in a venue in their capacity as delegates or official visitors; this occurred in the stadium of Aphrodisias, the theatre of Ephesus, and the amphitheatre of Nîmes.¹³⁵ The claim to personal as well as group identity, whether or not the group was local, was a way in which an individual could affiliate himself with a larger, established body while at the same time retaining his personal identity. These individually identified seats are only appropriate in an audience in

¹³⁴ 55.10.

¹³⁵ See Chapters 2 and 3. The reservation of seats for delegates of provincial *concilia* such as occurred in Tarragona and Lyon does not serve the same function (below).

which the visible distinction of different levels of the social hierarchy is important and in which the body of spectators as a whole has already been subdivided into larger groups. Personal claims to identity are then evidence of internal stratification within these larger groups.¹³⁶

Women were one portion of the population to whom a different type of group membership, that in a family of high social standing, appears to have been an advantage in terms of the grant of privileged seating. In two towns of Republican Italy, Capua and Interamna Nahars, women appear to have been granted their own seating areas but there is no way of determining whether these areas had any degree of internal stratification, that is, whether the wives of senators were seated at the front and less distinguished women at the rear.¹³⁷ Under the *lex Iulia theatralis* Augustus moved all women to the back of the audience except Vestal Virgins, and then from Tiberius onward imperial women were allowed to sit with these priestesses. It seems that the segregation of women was not strictly observed in provincial audiences in the West. There is evidence for individual women being granted their own seats at the front of the venue, an arrangement very different from that in Rome. A Tiberian inscription from Cumae grants a local individual and his mother the right to sit in a *tribunal* opposite the individual sponsoring the games (although the right may only have been given to the son), in Avaricum Biturigum an inscription from the amphitheatre podium reserves a seat for the daughter of a local duumvir, and on the podium wall of the amphitheatre of Nîmes is inscribed the name

¹³⁶ van Nijf 1997, 217. For more on this see Chapter 3.

¹³⁷ See Chapter 2.

Severina.¹³⁸ Women were also granted reserved seats in the *cavea* at large, but they were assigned seats much less frequently than men.

The involvement of specific women in *corpora* of the *Augustales* raises the possibility that they may have been allowed to share in the reserved seating of this group as well, and the *lex de Flamonio Provinciae Galliae Narbonensis* states that the wife of the *flamen*, the high priest of the provincial imperial cult, was allowed to attend games with her husband and she might have shared in his privileged seating.¹³⁹ Although women in the West were able to hold certain offices, in none of the surviving seating inscriptions is an office mentioned even though this would seem to be a way in which a woman might obtain a seat at the front of the venue. In fact, of the three known instances in which women were granted seats either on a podium or in a *tribunal*, in two of these (in Cumae and Avaricum Biturigum) the women were expressly associated with male family members, and they may only have been given privileged seating because the male relatives to whom they were linked were of a high social standing. If the wife of the high priest was in fact granted privileged seating in Narbonensis it may only have been because of the merit of her husband rather than because she held office herself.¹⁴⁰ It seems that for women in the West membership in a family of elevated status was the best, and perhaps only, way in which a reserved seat at the front of the audience could be obtained.

¹³⁸ AE 1927, 158; Sherk 1970, no. 41; 33; 30.2; Chapter 2.

¹³⁹ The *lex de Flamonio Provinciae Galliae Narbonensis*: FIR 1.22; ILS 6964; CIL XII 6038. For more on the imperial cult in *Gallia Narbonensis* see Gros (1990).

¹⁴⁰ While she may have held another office on her own, her relationship with the high priest did not automatically make her the high priestess of the imperial cult (Fishwick 2002, vol. III.1, 7).

There is no evidence for seats being reserved for eastern women at the very front of the audience on an individual basis or because of offices held. In Athens women were granted seats in the second row and above due to their involvement in civic life as priestesses or the holders of other religious offices, but these seats were reserved for the office and not the woman.¹⁴¹ All of the individuals to whom seats were granted in the first row (the area of the highest prestige), and it seems, in the central *cuneus* almost in its entirety, were men.¹⁴² Seats were assigned to women holding offices in other venues as well. In the stadium of Didyma the female agonothete who was identified both by name and by office was seated in the third row and in the theatre of Termessus an area whose extent is unclear was reserved for a group of priestesses of the imperial cult.¹⁴³ Seats were also reserved for eastern women on an individual basis, and although these seats could be near the front of the audience they were not located at the very front as they could be in the West. In the stadium of Didyma a seat in the second row was inscribed for a Claudia Bassilla who was the daughter or wife of a Xenophon.¹⁴⁴ Among the several seats reserved for women in the theatre of Dionysus was one inscribed for a woman who was expressly identified as Μηδίου θυγάτηρ, the daughter of Medeus; others were granted to a Theoxena, Theano, Ladameia, and a Megista.¹⁴⁵ Seats were also reserved for women without mention of an office in

¹⁴¹ Chapter 3.

¹⁴² 1.1, .5-16. The members of the local council must have shared the central *cuneus* in some fashion with those holding religious office, or perhaps it was the members of the local council who were the ones holding these offices (Chapter 3 n. 102).

¹⁴³ 68.3.13b; 77.6.2.

¹⁴⁴ 68.2.36.

¹⁴⁵ 2.6l; .11h; .12a; 2.7m; 2.6m, .6o, .9a.

the venues of Aphrodisias. Carminia Claudiana, a member of a prominent Aphrodisian family, was granted her own seat in the *summa cavea* of the theatre, and in the stadium Claudia Seleuceia was assigned her own area also near the back of the audience.¹⁴⁶ Two other women were given seats in the eleventh row of the same venue.¹⁴⁷

It appears that unlike western women, women in the East were not able to obtain seats in the first row, even though they could be identified by office in seating inscriptions whereas western women were not. The segregation of women not holding office seems to have been more strictly enforced in the East than in the West, perhaps due to both earlier classical Athenian tradition and the influence of the *lex Iulia theatralis*.¹⁴⁸ Membership in an important family seems to have been, however, as advantageous in the East as it was in the West. In more than one instance in the eastern provinces the woman to whom the seat was granted was expressly identified in terms of her father or husband or was a member of a prominent local family. The family of Carminia Claudiana, for example, was prominent in Aphrodisias in the mid-second century C.E. and a male relative spent 10,000 denarii on the *cavea* of the theatre.¹⁴⁹ This donation, or at least her membership in this family, entitled Carminia to a reserved seat inscribed with elegant letters, and all who saw her in attendance would be reminded of the beneficence and power of her family. This was also the case in Rome, where the Vestal Virgins were seated at the

¹⁴⁶ **65.88b; 67.20**; see also Chapter 3.

¹⁴⁷ **67.26**.

¹⁴⁸ For the seating of women in classical Athens, see Chapter 3; for the *lex Iulia theatralis* see Chapter 1.

¹⁴⁹ Roueché 1993, 117; **65.88b**; Lewis 1974, 91M.

front of the audience. There were several factors behind this honour: the religious importance of the Vestal Virgins, their role as Roman women who should be emulated, but also perhaps their role as public symbols of their male family members.¹⁵⁰ Imperial women were not allowed to sit at the front of spectacular venues until Tiberius honoured Livia in this fashion, but once in view of the audience these women would certainly have served as a reminder of the power of the emperor.¹⁵¹ It therefore seems to be an empire-wide trend that the grant of reserved seating to women was based to a certain extent upon the social standing and civic involvement of the men with whom they associated, whether by birth or by marriage.

Spectacular Venues and the Imperial Cult

Spectacular venues were an integral part of the imperial cult and the worship of the emperor. Processions, certainly not limited to those created by personal foundations such as those of Salutaris and Demosthenes, paraded into these venues in order to celebrate the power of the emperor and to participate in religious festivities in general. Carried by the participants in these events were statues of the god or goddess in whose name the festival was being held, while in those relating to the imperial cult symbols of the emperor were carried, such as a statue, shield, or chair (in Ephesus, for example, the images carried in Salutaris' procession included several of Artemis as well as of Trajan and Augustus, and in Oenoanda Apollo and the emperors were

¹⁵⁰ Chapter I.

¹⁵¹ See, for example, Purcell (1986); Flory (1993); Boatwright (2000).

represented).¹⁵² During the reign of Tiberius, on each day of the five-day festival of the Caesarea in Gytheum images of Augustus, Livia, and Tiberius were carried from the temple of Asclepius and Hygieia to the imperial shrine and then into the theatre.¹⁵³ Such processions were common in the Greek East. In classical Athens, for example, a statue of Dionysus was carried in procession into the theatre during the Great Dionysia where it was placed in order to watch the competitions.¹⁵⁴ Perhaps the most famous procession of the Hellenistic period is that of Ptolemy Philadelphus which took place in Alexandria sometime between 279 and 270 B.C.E.¹⁵⁵

These events also took place in the West, having as their origin the practice in Rome which included the *pompa circensis* in which representations of the gods were carried in litters.¹⁵⁶ It appears to have been Caesar who first accepted the honour of having a golden chair bearing his crown carried into the theatre (although it did not actually occur until after his death); the senate also granted that his chariot be carried in the *pompa circensis*.¹⁵⁷ Golden chairs were carried into and set up in the theatre for, among others, Sejanus, Tiberius, Gaius, and Commodus.¹⁵⁸ Processions in which symbols of imperial power were carried would have been part of the celebrations of the imperial cult in the Latin West as they were in the East. Images of

¹⁵² Among countless examples of such a practice is a letter to the city of Alexandria in 41 C.E. in which Claudius acquiesces to having a golden statue in his likeness and a throne carried in procession (Lewis 1974, 37.B). For the symbolic presence of the emperor in spectacular venues see below.

¹⁵³ SEG XI 923. Price (1980, 31) notes that the sacrifices made during this procession, in front of the Caesareum, in the agora, and a sacrifice of incense in the theatre, were never made to the emperor and his family but were instead made on their behalf.

¹⁵⁴ Hanson (1959, 86); Pickard-Cambridge (1968, 58-59).

¹⁵⁵ See Rice (1983).

¹⁵⁶ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.*, 7.72; see Taylor (1935) and Hanson (1959, 81-86) for *pompae* in general.

¹⁵⁷ Dio Cass. 44.6.3.

the emperors were carried from imperial temples or altars to amphitheatres and theatres on days important to the cult, such as the *natalis* of the emperor, and then at the end of the day were carried back to the temples or altars.¹⁵⁹ Although there is little direct evidence for these processions, the proximity of the imperial cult complexes to spectacular venues suggests that this is the case. The arrangements in Lyon are particularly suggestive, where two *vomitoria* from the amphitheatre lead directly into the complex, facilitating the movement of processions from one area to the other. Processions for the imperial cult would have served, as the relationship between the complex and the amphitheatre in Lyon demonstrates, to link the various public locations in which worship of the emperor took place, including the altar, forum, temple, theatre, and amphitheatre. These processions emphasized the relationship between the political and religious centres of the cities.¹⁶⁰ At both the provincial and municipal level of the imperial cult these processions would also, with their display of the local social hierarchy, have promoted social cohesion as did those processions established by Salutaris and Demosthenes.¹⁶¹ The proposed association between spectacular venues and the imperial cult is supported by the epigraphic evidence. Several texts from the amphitheatre of Lyon reserving seats for representatives of members of the *Tres Galliae* confirm its primary function as a venue used for

¹⁵⁸ Dio Cass. 58.4.4, 73.17.4; Suet. *Gaius* 16.4.

¹⁵⁹ It seems that theatres were generally associated with the municipal, rather than provincial, branches of the cult (below). For more on processions of the imperial cult see Fishwick (1991, vol. II.1, 550-566); for more on the imperial images that would have been carried in these processions see Price (1984, 170-206).

¹⁶⁰ Price 1984, 110-111.

¹⁶¹ Fishwick 1991, vol. II.1, 556.

the celebration of the provincial imperial cult by the *concilium* of the *Tres Galliae*. This *concilium*, comprising envoys from the various peoples of *Gallia Lugdunensis*, *Gallia Aquitania*, and *Gallia Belgica*, not only encouraged the tolerance of Rome and its leader but also acted as a liaison body connecting these Gallic provinces to the central government.¹⁶² It was in Lyon that the imperial cult was first established in the Roman West, when Drusus erected an altar to the deified Caesar at the confluence of the Rhône and Saône rivers in 12 B.C.E.¹⁶³ The *concilium* met once a year and two of its duties at this time were to elect the high priest of the cult and also to celebrate Augustus' *natalis* with festivities that included games held in the amphitheatre.¹⁶⁴ The close proximity of the amphitheatre, originally constructed in the second decade of the first century C.E. by the high priest of the imperial cult at that time, to the provincial cult sanctuary reveals the connection between the spectacular venue and the celebration of the power of the emperor.¹⁶⁵ That the amphitheatre must be considered an integral part of the complex as a whole is confirmed by the presence of two *vomitoria* leading from the amphitheatre into the sanctuary. In its first incarnation the amphitheatre of Lyon was designed only for the use of the delegates of

¹⁶² Christopherson 1968, 351, 364-365, Deininger 1965, 99-107. For more on western *concilia* and their eastern counterpart the *koina* see Deininger (1965, 36-98, 99-135) and Millar (1984, 387-394).

¹⁶³ Dio Cass. 54.32; Livy *Epit.* 139; Suet. *Claud.* 2 (although he appears to be providing a date of 10 B.C.E.); see Fishwick (1987, vol. I.1, 97-99, 102-130; 1996a; 2002, vol. III.1, 9-20; 2004, vol. III.3, 107-120); Futrell (2000, 157 n. 13). While the altar was the focal point of worship for the first century and a half after its construction, a temple of the imperial cult was built at a later date: Fishwick (1972) suggests that the temple was erected between 121 and 136 C.E.

¹⁶⁴ Futrell (2000, 81) suggests that the role of the chief priest of the imperial cult in provincial civic administration may have been similar to that of the Roman *ensor*, to review membership in the *concilium*.

¹⁶⁵ The amphitheatre was originally constructed in 19 C.E. by Caius Iulius Rufus and his son and was expanded in the first half of the second century (*AE* 1959, 78, 81; Audin 1969, 22-23; Audin 1979; Audin and Le Glay 1970, 69; Golvin 1988, nos. 85, 171); also Fishwick (1972, 51; 1987 vol. I.1 134); Futrell (2000, 83).

the *Tres Galliae* and its *cavea* consisted merely of a podium upon which the approximately eighteen hundred delegates could be seated.¹⁶⁶ Envoys from peoples such as the *Arverni*, the *Bituriges Cubi*, the *Tricassi*, the *Vellavi*, and also perhaps either the *Aedui*, the *Viromandui*, or the *Viducassi* would have had their own areas in the original *cavea*.¹⁶⁷ Since the representatives of the *Arverni* and *Bituriges Cubi* were seated next to one another it is possible that the delegates were arranged in alphabetical order.

When the amphitheatre was expanded in the early second century C.E. its *cavea* was then comparable in size to that of the amphitheatres of Arles and Nîmes.¹⁶⁸ Seating inscriptions reveal that after its expansion the festival was opened to delegates from outside of the *Tres Galliae* who may have been formally invited to attend.¹⁶⁹ Representatives of the *Glanici* from *Gallia Narbonensis* were provided with seats as may have been the *Antipolitani* from the same region.¹⁷⁰ The local inhabitants of Lyon also appear to have at some point been allowed to be present. Several texts may be reserving seats for individuals and the *Augustales* seem to have had seats on the podium.¹⁷¹ The seating inscriptions from the amphitheatre of Lyon therefore not only reinforce its primary role as a venue for the celebration of the provincial imperial cult but also reveal that at a later date individuals from outside of the *concilium* were present.

¹⁶⁶ Fishwick 2004, vol. III.3, 122.

¹⁶⁷ 36.1, .2, .3; 37.6, .7a.

¹⁶⁸ Fishwick 1987, vol I.1, 134.

¹⁶⁹ Fishwick 1991, vol. II.1, 581; 2004 vol. III.3, 120-122.

¹⁷⁰ 36.6, .7.

¹⁷¹ 36.5, 37.4, .5, .8, .9; 37.1. One inscription may refer to a local group of *macellarii*, butchers (36.8), although the less likely restoration *Macedonum* has also been suggested; Chapter 2.

Two inscriptions from Tarragona, similar to those from Lyon, may provide comparable insight. Tarragona was the centre for the provincial imperial cult of *Hispania Citerior* as well as for a municipal branch of the cult. An altar, most likely for municipal worship, was erected by the city in 2 B.C.E. and a temple to *Divus Augustus* was commissioned by Tiberius in 15 C.E.; these may have been located together in a forum.¹⁷² During the Flavian period a three-tiered complex devoted to the provincial imperial cult was constructed in the upper town, comprising a temple to Rome and Augustus, the forum of the *concilium provinciae Hispaniae Citerioris*, and a circus.¹⁷³ The middle terrace of this complex appears to have been devoted to meetings of members of the *concilium*.¹⁷⁴ Two identical seating inscriptions reserve places for envoys from peoples of the *concilium*, the *Metercosani*, who lived in the border area of the *Vettones* and the *Carpetani*.¹⁷⁵ The original location of these inscriptions is unknown but it has been suggested that they come from either the city's theatre or from an administrative building on the middle terrace in which meetings of the *concilium* were held.¹⁷⁶ It seems just as plausible that these inscriptions may have come from the amphitheatre of Tarragona. Although the amphitheatre,

¹⁷² Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.77; Tac. *Ann.* 1.78; Carreté et al., 30-31. There is debate over the nature of the original temple and altar and whether it was for a municipal, rather than provincial, branch of the imperial cult; Fishwick (1982). For more on the municipal temple see Fishwick (1996b, 172-174) who also discusses the provincial temple (176-182).

¹⁷³ Ted'A 1989; Carreté et al. 1995, 31-32. The temple in this complex was originally thought to be that commissioned by Tiberius but archeological exploration has made it clear that the temple is in fact Flavian, although some of its decorative elements appear to be Julio-Claudian (Fishwick 1997, 36-37). The uncertainty surrounding the architecture of the temple is best explained by Fishwick (1987, vol. I.1, 150-154; 2002, vol. III.1, 43-52; 2004, vol. III.3, 5-30).

¹⁷⁴ Fishwick 2004, vol. III.3, 31-35.

¹⁷⁵ 47.1, .2.

¹⁷⁶ *CIL* II 4280 *ad loc.*; Alföldy 1975, nos. 250a, b; Fishwick 1997, 40, 46.

dated by some scholars to the Julio-Claudian period and by others to the Flavian period, was not an official part of the complex it was still located within significant proximity and should be taken as related to it.¹⁷⁷

A clear relationship between the amphitheatre of Tarragona and the imperial cult is provided by its dedicatory inscription which reveals that the priest of the provincial imperial cult funded its construction, as was also the case in Lyon.¹⁷⁸ Although the circus on the bottom level of the complex in Tarragona presumably would have been the main venue in which spectacles for the imperial cult were held, the close proximity of the amphitheatre to the provincial complex as well as its construction by the high priest suggest that it may have served a similar purpose.¹⁷⁹ Delegates from the *concilium* may have had reserved seats in the amphitheatre along with members of the local community, similar to the second stage of seating arrangements in Lyon.¹⁸⁰ There seems to be little reason to prefer the theatre to the amphitheatre as the original location of the inscriptions reserving seats for the envoys of the *concilium*. This is supported not only by the connection between the amphitheatre and the provincial imperial cult in Tarragona and other cities, but also by the closer physical proximity of the Tarragonan amphitheatre to the provincial complex than the theatre. It is possible that the seating inscriptions came from the circus which was part of the complex, although no seating inscriptions seem to have survived from any circus

¹⁷⁷ Fishwick 1991, vol. II.1, 580-581; 2004, vol. III.3, 38-40. Julio-Claudian date: Futrell 2000, 58 following Golvin 1988, no. 139. Early second century: Dupré i Raventós 1994, 81-82; Gros 1994c, 27-28.

¹⁷⁸ AE 1990, 653; Dupré i Raventós (1994, 81); Fishwick (1997, 49).

¹⁷⁹ Fishwick 2004, vol. III.3, 35-38.

¹⁸⁰ A seating inscription from the amphitheatre reserves an area for local *seviri* (48.2).

in the empire. The inscriptions from the unknown venue in Tarragona were found in conjunction with another that assigns space to a group or individual, but this text unfortunately does nothing to shed light on their original location.¹⁸¹ Although the possibility that these inscriptions came from an administrative building in which the *concilium* met cannot be ignored, it seems reasonable to suggest not only that they came instead from a spectacular venue, but also that it is likely that this venue was the city's amphitheatre instead of theatre.

The amphitheatre of Sarmizegetusa, the capital of Dacia, is located just to the west of the provincial imperial cult complex and would have housed the celebrations of the *concilium Daciarum trium* (*Dacia Inferior*, *Superior*, and *Porolissensis* after the accession of Hadrian, but after the reorganization of Marcus Aurelius, *Dacia Apulensis*, *Malvensis*, and *Porolissensis*).¹⁸² As with the meetings of the *concilium* of the *Tres Galliae* in Lyon, in Sarmizegetusa envoys from the different *civitates* involved would have attended the annual meetings. Local *Augustales* also might have had reserved *bisellia* at the front of this venue.¹⁸³ It has been suggested that one of the most important functions of provincial amphitheatres was to function as a means of “ostentatious expression of loyalty to the emperor.”¹⁸⁴ This relationship between the amphitheatre and the emperor is made manifest in Lyon, where the venue formed part of the complex for the provincial imperial cult and was used to hold the festivals of the annual meetings

¹⁸¹ **47.3.** Similar assignments of space are found in the theatre of Cordoba (**42.1**) and in the Flavian amphitheatre in Rome (Orlandi 2004, nos. 14.1, 14.3, 14.7, 14.8, 14.15, 14.18, 14.20).

¹⁸² Tudor 1962, 201-202, 213; Fishwick 1997, 48; 2004, vol. III.3, 173.

¹⁸³ **10.3, 11.2.**

¹⁸⁴ Futrell 2000, 58, 65, 93; also Fishwick 1997, 48; Hanson 1997, 77.

of the *concilium* of the *Tres Galliae*, and also in Sarmizegetusa. A similar arrangement may have been in place in Tarragona, where the amphitheatre was used not only for the entertainment of the local inhabitants but also perhaps to hold celebrations of the provincial assembly meant, among other things, to reaffirm the loyalty of the peoples in question to the emperor via the imperial cult. In most urban areas, such as Tarragona, involved with imperial worship it was not the emperor who initiated the development of the cult; rather it was the community itself which undertook the worship, and the reorganization of urban space that accompanied it, encouraged by the emperor.¹⁸⁵

Amphitheatres could be associated not only with provincial but also municipal centres for emperor worship in the West, although it was theatres that tended to be the preferred venue for the municipal branches of the cult. Theatres were more closely associated with the civic rather than provincial forum or complex and were therefore related to the civic rather than provincial worship of the cult.¹⁸⁶ The amphitheatre of Mérida, the capital of *Lusitania*, was several hundred metres away from the provincial cult complex, farther than at Tarragona and Sarmizegetusa but still within easy walking distance. In Mérida, as opposed to in Sarmizegetusa, Tarragona, and Lyon, a previously existing area of the city was adapted for use by the provincial cult rather than a new cult complex being constructed.¹⁸⁷ A unique feature of the amphitheatre in

¹⁸⁵ Hingley 2005, 85.

¹⁸⁶ Fishwick 2004, vol. III.3, 65-66, 191.

¹⁸⁷ Fishwick 2004, vol. III.3, 59. This was also the case in Cordoba, the capital of *Baetica*, where two already existing fora of the city were adapted for provincial purposes (Fishwick 2004, vol. III.3, 71). For more on the fora of Mérida and Cordoba see Trillmich (1996).

this town is that it is located directly adjacent to the theatre, both constructed prior to the allocation of space to the cult complex, whereas in other provincial capitals the theatre and amphitheatre were distinct venues. The inscriptions that come from the theatre of Mérida are those of municipal, not provincial, priests of the cult; a *sacrarium* in the centre of the *ima cavea* which held statues related to the imperial cult and was presumably connected with sacrifices and processions has been dated to the time of Trajan.¹⁸⁸ A similar *sacrarium* may have existed in the theatre of Cordoba.¹⁸⁹ The relationship between imperial cult and spectacular venue in the West was not always limited to amphitheatres and theatres since, at least in the case of Tarragona, a circus was involved as well.¹⁹⁰

In the East the imperial cult was used as a tool to integrate the autonomous and largely previously Hellenized cities into the Roman empire. In 29 B.C.E. Asia and Bithynia were allowed by Octavian to establish sanctuaries in Ephesus and Nicaea for the cult of *Roma* and Julius Caesar at which Roman citizens could worship; sanctuaries for Greeks were simultaneously established at Pergamum and Nicomedia.¹⁹¹ The imperial cult quickly spread throughout the eastern provinces. The key to its success was finding a place for the head of

¹⁸⁸ Trillmich 1989-1990; 1993, 116-117; Fishwick 2004, vol. III.3, 69.

¹⁸⁹ Ventura Villanueva 1991, 64-65, no. 1; Fishwick 2004, vol. III.3, 103. For more on the theatre of Cordoba see Jansen (2005, 348-357).

¹⁹⁰ For more on the imperial cult in Tarragona in particular see Pensabene (1996); for the imperial cult in the West in general see Fishwick (1987-2004, esp. 1991, vol. II.1, 574-584 and 2004, vol. III.3, 305-349 on spectacles as part of the cult); Le Glay (1991); Le Roux (1994); Futrell (2000, 80-84, 92-93). For the imperial cult in Roman Africa see, for example, Smadja (1978, 2005); Rives (2001). Tassaux (1999) discusses expressions of personal devotion to the cult of the emperor, rather than those performed through an official municipal or provincial organization.

¹⁹¹ Dio Cass. 51.20.5-7.

Roman power in the traditional pantheon of eastern gods. Through the incorporation of visible symbols of the emperor into festivals and rituals, the eastern cities were provided with a familiar way in which they could conceptualize the new political situation.¹⁹² Unlike in the western provinces, in the East there was historical basis for the cult of a ruler. Worship of the Hellenistic kings was reasonably common but it should be noted that it was of a different nature than worship of the Roman emperor. These Hellenistic cults were localized and came and went over time with the individual members of the dynasties.¹⁹³ The imperial cult was much more standardized and widespread than were the cults of the kings and its appearance was not a response to specific interventions by the ruler in particular cities as were the Hellenistic cults.¹⁹⁴

The promulgation of the imperial cult in the East was facilitated by the existence of provincial assemblies, *koina* (the Greek equivalent of the western *concilia*), that were responsible for acting as mediators between the emperor and local communities, as well as for organizing regular imperial festivals that were presided over by the high priest.¹⁹⁵ These priests came from the local elite, as did those of the western provinces. One of the reasons for the success of the imperial cult in Greek culture was its ability to capitalize on the competition not only between the elite in a single community but also between communities. The cult therefore functioned to provide eastern communities with a way in which to negotiate Roman domination by providing

¹⁹² Price 1984, 7. This is only a brief discussion of the imperial cult in the Roman East, for which Price's 1984 work on the cult in Asia Minor is of great value; see also Bowersock (1965, 112-121).

¹⁹³ Price 1984, 23-40, esp. 24, 36.

¹⁹⁴ Price 1984, 43, 56; Mitchell 1993, 113.

¹⁹⁵ Bowersock 1965, 115-116; Price 1984, 56. For more on western *concilia* and their eastern

links between the East and Rome as well as links within the East itself.¹⁹⁶ The power and presence of the emperor was introduced in the eastern provinces through assimilation into an already existing tradition of ruler worship as well as into traditional cults and festivals of local gods or goddesses.¹⁹⁷ In the foundation of *Salutaris*, for example, created not in honour of the emperor but of Artemis and in which personnel of the imperial cult played a very small role, the power of the emperor is still made manifest by the imperial images that were not only carried in the procession but in fact lead it through the city.¹⁹⁸

Although the ritual of the eastern imperial cult was based in Greek tradition, some elements of its celebration were purely Roman in origin. Gladiatorial fights and *venationes* (animal hunts) were held in modified stadia and theatres since amphitheatres were very rarely constructed in the East. These shows were put on in the eastern provinces almost exclusively in connection with both the provincial and municipal branches of the imperial cult.¹⁹⁹ In eastern communities *munera* and *venationes* did not fall under the responsibility of the city as a whole as did some athletic and musical events, but were instead put on by private citizens who were almost always the high priests of either the municipal or provincial branches of the imperial cult.²⁰⁰ Theatres were generally modified by building a wall around the orchestra or by lowering

counterpart the *koina* see Deininger (1965, 36-98, 99-135) and Millar (1984, 387-394).

¹⁹⁶ Price 1984, 62-63, 65, 77, 100, 102; Ando 2000, 62, 132.

¹⁹⁷ Price 1984, 103; Mitchell 1993, 113.

¹⁹⁸ Rogers 1991a, 49-50, 52-54, 70; see above.

¹⁹⁹ Robert 1971, 33-34, 35, 240, 243, 256; Welch 1998, 123. See Chapter 3 for a discussion of the relationship between Greek agonistic festivals and the imperial cult.

²⁰⁰ Robert 1971, 267-275.

the level of the orchestra itself and adding a podium to separate the spectators from the action taking place.²⁰¹ Stadia were modified in a similar fashion, but these modifications generally took place later than those to theatres.²⁰² The stadium at Aphrodisias, for example, was altered by the construction of a small arena in its eastern end. The stadium at Sagalassos, perhaps constructed under Nero, was also used for such displays as is proven by its high podium; within the theatre of this city was found a relief of *venationes*.²⁰³ In general *venationes* were more commonly displayed in stadia than in theatres because of their larger size; gladiatorial presentations, at least until the mid-second century C.E., would have commonly taken place in these venues as well. Fewer theatres and stadia were altered in mainland Greece than in Asia Minor but gladiatorial shows and *venationes* were still held in these traditional venues; theatres in the Near East show no signs of having been adapted for Roman spectacles.²⁰⁴ In these buildings, as in all venues used for the celebration of the imperial cult throughout the empire, cult personnel were given privileged seating in accordance with their status. In both the East and the West the high priest of provincial and municipal branches was given a seat at or very near to the front of the audience (in

²⁰¹ Modifications to the orchestras of many Greek theatres do not appear to have been undertaken until the mid to late second century C.E. (Welch 1998, 127).

²⁰² Izenour 1992, 193-198; Welch 1998, 121-122; Carter 1999, 269-278.

²⁰³ Talloen and Waelkens, 2004, 183, 206-207; see Chapter 3 for more on the influence of the Romans on the architecture of Greek spectacular venues.

²⁰⁴ Welch 1998, 131; Retzleff 2003, 131. The Panathenaic Stadium in Athens, constructed in the mid second century C.E. by Herodes Atticus, is an example of a mainland Greek stadium built under Roman rule. His stadium did not, however, reflect Roman building and civic practices, as did most new stadia constructed in Asia Minor, but was instead traditionally Greek in nature despite its larger size and attested function as a venue for *venationes*. Welch (1998, 133-138) suggests that the stadium and the theatre of Herodes Atticus should be seen together, and that the stadium represented the Greek aspects of his personal and public life while the theatre represented the Roman aspects.

Gallic Narbo, for example, they were seated among Roman senators and the local decurions), and high priestesses could also be given reserved seats as they were in Termessus.²⁰⁵ Other imperial cult personnel were also granted reserved seats throughout the empire.²⁰⁶

Ruler worship in the two halves of the empire was very similar.²⁰⁷ The imperial cult provided a way for the various peoples throughout the Roman provinces to make sense of their social and political position. It was a means by which the central government could attempt to control the activities of local communities and was an avenue through which local communities could visualize and understand their place within a larger political and ideological system.²⁰⁸ One noticeable difference between emperor worship in the East and in the West is that no equivalent eastern body existed for the *Augustales*. Within Greek communities there was no category of ex-slaves that needed to be provided with an official fashion in which they could be involved in their communities, as was needed for *liberti* in the West.²⁰⁹ In the empire as a whole the celebrations of the imperial cult, involving gladiatorial competitions and *venationes*, took place in theatres, amphitheatres, and even circuses; these venues were also linked to ruler worship through the processions that opened and closed the festivities. The power of the

²⁰⁵ The seating of the high priestesses in Termessus: 77.6.2. In Narbo the privileged seating of the high priest of the provincial cult among Roman senators and decurions is provided for in lines 5-6 of the Vespasianic *lex de Flamonio Provinciae Galliae Narbonensis*: FIR 1.22; ILS 6964; CIL XII 6038.

²⁰⁶ See Chapters 2 and 3.

²⁰⁷ Price 1984, 74-75. He proposes (1984, 66) a "gift-exchange model" for the imperial cult in Asia Minor and the East in general that can also be applied to the West. Although eastern cities founded local branches of the cult in order to honour and maintain close ties with the emperor, "the general imperial acceptance of civic cults and the possibility of penalties for non-fulfillments of promised cults combined to create considerable, covert central pressure for the establishment and continuation of cults."

²⁰⁸ Price 1984, 132, 239-240, 248.

emperor, an integral component of the imperial cult, was made manifest in these venues not only by the images of the imperial family that were carried in procession, but also by permanent statuary, whether found in the *caveae* or on the stage buildings themselves.²¹⁰

The emperor was obviously very rarely, if ever, present in person, but his power was certainly represented symbolically. Images or symbols of the emperor were carried into venues in processions for the imperial cult and other statues were on permanent display in these venues.²¹¹ The arrival of an imperial image was regarded by a community as an event of equal importance to the actual *adventus* of the emperor. In Termessus Minor in Lycia on the day that a sacred image of the younger Valerian was brought to the town shows were held in the amphitheatre.²¹² In Stratonicea in Lydia a chair of state was placed in the audience at games for Nerva, and in the theatre of Ephesus images of the members of the imperial house were placed upon statue bases located at the front of the audience.²¹³ A *sacrarium* constructed during the time of Trajan at the front of the theatre of Mérida was designed to hold six imperial statues and the decoration of the *scaenae frons* and rest of the theatre building included imperial statue groups from the time of Augustus and of Claudius.²¹⁴ The decoration of the *scaenae frons* of the

²⁰⁹ Price 1984, 88-89, 114.

²¹⁰ Price (1984, 206) states that it was primarily through the use of imperial images that the power of the emperor was diffused and incorporated into the Greek provinces.

²¹¹ For the political uses of portraits and other images in Rome see, for example, Gregory (1994).

²¹² *ILS* 8870, l. 19f; Fishwick 1991, vol. II.1, 553; also Ando 2000, 232, 251.

²¹³ The grant of a curule chair to Nerva occurred in 96 C.E. (Lewis 1974 pg 23 no. F); see above for the arrangements in Ephesus.

²¹⁴ Trillmich 1989-1990; 1993. The statues in the exedra of the peristyle were Augustan in date and they comprised images of Augustus, Tiberius, and Drusus (Trillmich 1993, 113-114); the imperial statues decorating the *scaenae frons* were from the time of Claudius (Trillmich 1993, 114-116). For the Trajanic

theatre of Hierapolis not only celebrated the imperial family but also served to create ties between the city and Hellenic culture. Septimius Severus, Julia Domna, Geta, and Caracalla are all depicted in procession; both the Hellenistic and the Ephesian Artemis also appear.²¹⁵ This combination reveals that the inhabitants of Hierapolis, although acknowledging Roman power, wished to present themselves as having both a Greek heritage and a relationship with the city of Ephesus. In effect, Hierapolis was using theatre reliefs to create a civic identity for itself during the Roman period. The appearance of the imperial family is a nod to Roman power, the images of Hellenistic Artemis provide a Greek identity, and the presence of Ephesian Artemis implies a direct connection between Hierapolis and an important city in Asia Minor.²¹⁶ The iconography of the theatre reliefs was one of the tools used in Hierapolis' civic self-representation; along with such imagery, the organization of audiences was another tool available to communities throughout the empire.

Statues and other symbols of the emperor served an important function. Their presence in venues in which a large percentage of the local population was gathered, whether for celebrations of the imperial cult or for meetings of the assembly, provided a focus for attitudes towards the emperor and Roman rule. These statues contained within themselves the ideology of the Roman emperor and the empire as a whole and were designed to arouse in the viewer consideration – although surely they were not always considered favourably – about his or her

sacrarium see Trillmich (1993, 116-117).

²¹⁵ de Bernardi Ferrero 1966, vol. I., 59; for the reliefs of Apollo and Artemis see D'Andria and Ritti (1985).

individual place, as well as that of the local community, within a larger societal and political system.²¹⁷ S. Price states that images of the emperor and the imperial household located throughout the provinces "...not only constituted their own discourse, they were also objects of discourse."²¹⁸ The presence of these statues may also have been designed to remind the viewer that he or she was not alone in observing these statues; similar ones would have been found in venues throughout the empire.²¹⁹ The symbolism of these images in theatres and amphitheatres, the very venues in which rituals for the worship of the emperor took place, was most likely not lost on those in attendance.

The emperor was not only present in statues and other symbols but also in epigraphy. Dedicatory inscriptions, honorary inscriptions, and letters between communities and the emperors or his representatives in the provinces have all been found within the walls of spectacular venues. The placement of one of the inscriptions outlining Salutaris' foundation, including a letter from the provincial governor, on a *parodos* wall in the theatre of Ephesus is discussed above. Perhaps the most famous example of the symbolic presence of the ruler in a venue through epigraphy is the archive found on the northern *parodos* wall and neighbouring walls of the theatre of Aphrodisias, in which copies of communications between the central

²¹⁶ Newby 2003, 194-199.

²¹⁷ Price 1984, 205; Ando 2000, 209-215.

²¹⁸ Price 1984, 205.

²¹⁹ Ando (2000, 40-41) argues that one of the tools through which the imperial administration attempted to maintain provincial loyalty was through "an ideology of unification," that is, the similarity of the relationship that all individuals had to the emperor was emphasized.

government and the city were inscribed.²²⁰ This archive contains more material from the late Republic such as correspondence with Octavian, but it also includes letters from emperors including Commodus, Septimius Severus and Caracalla, and Severus Alexander. The emperor was always symbolically present in provincial venues and all the spectators would have been aware of his power. Spectacular *caveae* in the provinces were therefore a mix of the local display of society as arranged by the elite of the community (often recorded in seating inscriptions) with the display of imperial power through the symbolic presence of Rome and the emperor. The epigraphy of the venues reflected the organization of the audience, the acts of public beneficence by the local elite, and the power of the emperor. This joint display of local and imperial power would have reminded the spectators that although the leaders of their community had a certain amount of independence and autonomy, they were also part of a larger whole, of a system that was far more politically powerful.²²¹

²²⁰ Reynolds 1982, docs. 6, 16, 17, 18, 19.

²²¹ van Nijf 1997, 210, 216.

Conclusion

The organization of audiences in spectacular venues, as well as the choice of the particular representation of local society that these audiences were designed to display, was a concern throughout the empire. The starting point for this concern in Italy and the western provinces was the city of Rome. The *senatus consultum* reserving seats for senators in 194 B.C.E. and the legislation reserving seats for equestrians in 67 B.C.E. most likely acted as models for the seating of decurions in western communities, and the *lex Ursonensis* of circa 43 B.C.E. confirms that spectator arrangements were in place in colonies during the Republic. A *senatus consultum* passed under Augustus ensured that senators would be guaranteed seats anywhere in the empire that they might travel (although this did not always result in a front seat: in the stadium of Aphrodisias a senator was seated in the eighth row) and his *lex Iulia theatralis* appears to have been designed to be observed, in whatever form was appropriate for each community, throughout the West. In some areas of the East, on the other hand, there was a tradition of audience organization which makes it difficult to determine the extent of the influence of Augustan and later seating legislation in these areas. Renovations to eastern theatres and stadia carried out during the Roman period, however, allowing them to better accommodate a hierarchically-stratified model of society, reveal that Roman ideology had an impact. The organization of spectators enabled those in charge of the arrangements to, within limits, structure the micro-society of the audience as they chose, and to display an idealized representation designed according to their desires and motivations. Seating arrangements in place throughout

the empire therefore not only reflect the disparate social and civic structures of individual communities, but can also provide insight into the creation of a local self-identity by certain communities.

A chronological discussion of seating inscriptions can only be carried out in very general terms. The date of most of the inscriptions is unknown and it at best can be suggested that they are from the later stages of the venues, perhaps the third, fourth, and sometimes even fifth centuries C.E. In only a few venues have the texts been dated to the earlier empire, including in the stadium of Didyma and in the theatre of Dionysus in Athens where some inscriptions are Augustan and the majority appear to be Hadrianic. Factional inscriptions in particular would only have been carved at a later date.

There are differences in seating arrangements between venues in the East and those in the West.¹ One main difference lies in the types of venues themselves, that is, what type of spectacular edifice was constructed in which region. Theatres were found throughout the empire, although those in the West were generally of Roman design whereas those in the East could be modified Greek structures or of Roman design.² Odea, venues for small-scale theatrical or musical presentations, were also found throughout the empire although they were less common than theatres and were concentrated mainly in the East.³ Amphitheatres were venues of Roman origin and there were far fewer constructed in the eastern provinces than in the western, although

¹ It must be again stressed that these findings depend upon the survival and publication of seating inscriptions; as well, some texts may have been painted and are no longer visible; see Chapter 2.

² Dodge 1999, 208-215.

some do survive.⁴ Stadia were Greek venues and are therefore concentrated in the East, whereas western communities were more likely to have a circus.⁵ Stadia were still used under Roman rule for athletic competitions and some were modified to suit gladiatorial combat or *venationes* as well; those constructed under the Romans tended to be of a more monumental nature.⁶ This geographical spread of spectacular structures of course limits the type of venue in which seating inscriptions are found. In the West these texts appear in theatres and amphitheatres but they predominate in amphitheatres; in the East seating inscriptions survive in odea, theatres, and stadia but are most common in theatres. Although there is not a great difference in the number of inscriptions that survive from the West and the East, the number of inscriptions that remain *in situ* is higher in the eastern provinces and perhaps because of the hotter and dryer climate of these areas the texts are on the whole in a better state of survival.

In general, the practice of assigning seats was similar throughout the empire. The reservation of seats for senators throughout the empire has been discussed. Individuals or groups deemed important by the elite in charge of audience arrangements were granted their own seats. The main bodies of communities – the council and tribes as well as the council of elders in the East and the decurions and *Augustales* in the West – were privileged with reserved areas. Individuals holding religious office, members of professional associations, and youth groups also

³ Dodge 1999, 223.

⁴ Dodge 1999, 231-232; Futrell 2000, 5. Some eastern examples include the amphitheatres of Corinth (refounded as a Roman colony in 44 B.C.E.; Bomgardner 2000, 59-60), Pergamum, Bostra, Dura Europus, and Caesarea (Retzleff 2003, 131).

⁵ Dodge 1999, 241.

received seats. There is evidence from both the Latin- and Greek-speaking areas of the empire for peoples and individuals who were granted reserved seats in communities that were not their own. It is in the specifics of audience organization that the differences between the East and the West become clear.

Political bodies specific to the East (the βουλή and the council of elders) clearly had reserved seats only in the eastern provinces. Similarly, it is in the eastern venues that the evidence for seating by tribe predominates. This may be related to the classical Greek tradition of using the theatre as a place for political assemblies as well as a venue for entertainment, but many communities had a venue designed specifically for political meetings, namely, the bouleterion. The use of tribal seating in stadia and theatres should perhaps be seen as a transference of this pattern of audience arrangement, and does not in and of itself suggest that these venues housed political meetings. Almost all seating inscriptions for tribes come from theatres or odeia. It is only on the seats of the stadia of Aphrodisias and of Saittai that tribal texts are found, and only in Saittai could seating by tribe be a viable arrangement since those inscriptions from Aphrodisias seem to reserve seats only for certain representatives. The only inscriptions relating to seating by voting unit in the West come from the amphitheatre of Lambaesis, where the members of the *curiae* of the city were seated according to this affiliation. The erection of statues by *curiae* in the theatre of Lepcis Magna reveals that a similar arrangement was also in place in that venue.⁷ The

⁶ Izenour 1992, 193-198; Welch 1998, 121-122, 131.

⁷ *IRT* 391, 405, 406, 411, 413, 414, 416, 417, 420, 436, 541; also Torelli (1971); Kolendo (1981, 309).

number of seats reserved for members of *collegia* is much higher in the East, as is the variety of these groups. The evidence reveals that members of similar associations in different cities were not seated in the same areas; that is, that seating for each professional *collegium* was not standard throughout the communities in which these groups existed. Reserved seats for the members of these associations were found in all three types of eastern venue: theatres, odea, and stadia.

There are also more inscriptions in the catalogue for religious personnel in eastern communities than in the West, primarily because of the survival of such texts in the theatre of Dionysus in Athens and the stadium of Didyma. Even though seating inscriptions survive from sanctuary theatres in Altbachtal and Contiomagus in Germany, in these texts there is no indication of the tenure of religious office. Factional inscriptions are found only in the East, in the theatre of Alexandria, the theatre of Miletus, and the theatre, odeon, and stadium of Aphrodisias. It is also only in the eastern provinces that women are identified by both office and name in seating inscriptions; in the West there is no mention of office held on any seats reserved for women. In both eastern and western communities, however, it appears that at least some women were associated with their male relatives in seating inscriptions and it may be that the women in question were given the honour of a reserved seat only because of the social and civic standing of these men. Even though seats were granted to groups of young men in both the eastern and western provinces, they, and in particular the ephebes, are mentioned more frequently in eastern inscriptions. The importance of the ephebes to at least one community is clear in the

foundation created by Gaius Vibius Salutaris in Ephesus.⁸

As in the East, certain groups (the decurions and the *Augustales*) particular to the West were granted seats only in western communities. In terms of offices found throughout the empire, however, there is by far more evidence for identification by senatorial or equestrian rank in western venues. Quite a few inscriptions from the theatre of Carthage name senatorial men and perhaps senatorial youth as well, and many seating inscriptions for senators survive from the Colosseum.⁹ Seats are reserved for equestrians as a body in the theatres of Mérida and Orange, and an individual *eques* also had his own seat on the podium of the amphitheatre of Syracuse. In the eastern provinces, on the other hand, there are very few seating inscriptions in which such status is indicated. Indications of status are more common in western amphitheatres than western theatres; in theatres senators were seated on benches in the orchestra whereas in amphitheatres they had seats (in some cases portable) on the podium at the front of the *cavea*. It may have been more common to inscribe podium seats, even if chairs were then to be placed on them, than to inscribe the portable benches from the orchestra; even if the benches were inscribed, the number of podium seats found *in situ* is much higher than the number of benches discovered either *in* or *ex situ*.

It has been shown in this study that the representation of society on display in spectacular venues was not only a reflection of the disparate experiences of individual communities, but also in some cases one of the tools that the elite of a community could use to create or confirm a local

⁸ Chapter 4.

identity. Seating inscriptions can provide insight into the civic structure of a *municipium* or *colonia*, the arrangements of a provincial *concilium*, or the names of the members of a religious group within the larger community. In certain cases, particularly in the West, not all of the arrangements of this societal display were left to the choice of individual communities since seating legislation passed in Rome influenced provincial audiences. The organization of audience members in a community-specific, hierarchically-based fashion provided spectators not only with affirmation of their involvement in local society but also with a clear idea of their place within this society. The reservation of a seat or a group of seats represented the official grant of a defined place within the hierarchy of a venue, and of a society, in which the local population as well as visitors could be present. The presence of the local population was also important because audience organization was one of the ways in which the local elite could structure a community's identity for the benefit of its inhabitants. If visitors were to attend then they too would be aware of the local identity on display. The organization of audiences in the presence of symbols of the emperor provided spectators with affirmation that they as individuals, as well as their community as a whole, were also part of the larger Roman empire.

Actors and Gladiators within Roman society

Audience organization was not the only aspect of spectacular entertainment that served to display and to reinforce the social hierarchy. The architecture of the venues themselves reflected

⁹ Orlandi 2004, cat. nos. 16.1-74, 17.1-178.

the divisions in Roman society, not only among audience members but between spectators and performers. Legislation was also passed concerning who was allowed to perform on stage and in the arena since such behaviour was considered beneath the members of the upper *ordines* of Roman society.¹⁰

The architecture of Roman theatres and amphitheatres played an important role in guaranteeing the social hierarchy among spectators. In both permanent and temporary theatres and amphitheatres within and outside of Rome senatorial seating was often separated from the rest by a low wall and had its own entrances leading directly to the orchestra, in order to prevent the elite from coming into contact with the *plebs* and others who were not of their social standing.¹¹ The design of the Flavian amphitheatre is testament to the importance of maintaining the social hierarchy at spectacles since it actively encouraged the effective display of the social order in the audience, including a minimum of interaction between the *plebs* and individuals of a higher social status. The senators were seated at the very front of the audience on the podium of the amphitheatre and had their own entrances; *equites* could also access their seats directly and were seated either immediately behind the senators on large rows separate from the podium but distinct from the rest of the *cavea*, or in the lower area of the *cavea*. The podium and the few rows behind it were separated from the *ima cavea* by a wall. The *media cavea*, the *summa cavea*, and the *summa cavea in ligneis* were reached through increasingly complex pathways designed to facilitate spectator access to seats, directing individuals at different social levels in

¹⁰ The evidence for the status of actors and gladiators focuses on the city of Rome.

different directions.

The architecture of Roman venues also helped to reinforce the debased position of those performing or fighting. In the theatres actors were separated from the audience by the height of the wall (*proscenium*) upon which the stage was elevated and by the expanse of the orchestra, and at *munera* those in the arena were separated by barricades or the podium wall.¹² These architectural elements acted as effective social barriers; together with legislation concerning who was to perform, they extended the social hierarchy of the audience to include the occupants of the stage and arena. The audience members were defined as belonging to Roman society while those who were performing were defined as Other, as outside of Roman society. One of the most important aspects of Roman spectacle was the dichotomy between those watching and the objects of their gaze.¹³ The low standing of actors and gladiators in the hierarchy of the Roman state served to clarify and reinforce the place of the various social and legal levels of the audience members within that same hierarchy. Although the differences of status between audience members were never forgotten, the performers provided an object at whom the audience as a whole could direct its gaze.¹⁴

Actors and gladiators were seen as shameful because they sold their bodies for the

¹¹ Golvin and Landes 1990, 47; Parker 1999, 164, 166.

¹² Parker 1999, 166.

¹³ For this contrast see Hopkins (1983, 27-29); Brown (1991); Potter (1993); Plass (1995, 25-27); Wiedemann (1995); Coleman (1998); Parker (1999, 167-168). The following discussion of actors and gladiators is a general overview; for more detailed studies, see for example, Robert (1971); Jory (1986, 1970); Barton (1989, 1993); Wiedemann (1995); Potter (2002).

¹⁴ See, for example, Lim (1999, 359) on laughter as a unifying force between the different levels of the social hierarchy of the audience.

pleasure of others and constantly put themselves in the public gaze; this reputation was reflected in, and reinforced by, legislation.¹⁵ While the majority of actors and gladiators were slaves, freed, or free non-citizens (before the *constitutio Antoniniana* of 212 C.E.) some Roman citizens did choose to join these professions; when they did so they were classified as *infames* and lost the status of full citizen.¹⁶ *Infames* were subject to a variety of strict restrictions: they could not participate in local governments or stand for magistracies in Rome, they were banned from belonging to juries, and both actors and gladiators were prohibited from serving in the army.¹⁷ Under the *lex Iulia iudiciorum*, *infames* were not allowed to make accusations against others; the *lex Iulia de adulteriis* allowed a husband to kill his wife's lover if he found her with a slave, a condemned criminal, or an actor; under the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* those who were

¹⁵ In general chariot-drivers seem not to have been affected by legal restrictions, perhaps because of the historical associations of chariot driving as well as the lack of direct audience focus on the body of the charioteer (Edwards 1997, 75). For the disreputable status of actors and gladiators, see for example Tac. *Ann.* 1.77, 4.14, 11.21, 14.14; Petron. *Sat.* 126; Plut. *Vit. Sull.* 2.2-4, 33.2, 36.1; *SHA Gallieni* 17.7, 21.6; *Carus, Carinus, Numerian* 16.7, 20.4-21.1; Mart. 11.66.

¹⁶ Edwards 1997, 67, 69. In a detailed study of what it meant to be an *infamis* Edwards compares the legal status of *infames* with that of convicted criminals or dishonourably dismissed soldiers; in most cases it was the same, but the difference between the source of infamy is striking. Criminals and such soldiers could withdraw from public life but actors and gladiators only became infamous when they took up their public professions.

¹⁷ For participation in local governments see the *Tabula Heracleensis*, ll 108-125; for magistracies in Rome see Tert. *De spect.* 22 (also Edwards (1997, 72)). As an example of the prohibition against jury service, the *lex Acilia repetundarum* of 123 B.C.E. excluded men who had hired themselves out as gladiators from sitting on a jury of 450 equestrians (Cic., *Verr.* 1.9; *CIL* I².583; *FIRA*² 1.7). For service in the army see for example *Dig.* 48.19.14, 49.16.4. Although army service may seem to be a burden rather than a privilege, it was an important element of Roman citizenship (Edwards 1997, 71-72). Notably, *infames* were not protected from corporal punishment. Freedom from this type of punishment was a significant aspect of Roman citizenship and one of the most striking distinctions between free and slave or *infamis* in Rome. Cicero (*Verr.* 2.5.161-163) makes clear the horror in which Roman citizens held corporal punishment; see Edwards (1997, 73-74). Actors and gladiators were liable to corporal punishment at all times up until the end of the Republic when Augustus ruled that they could only be beaten at the time of the games and in the theatre (Suet. *Aug.* 45.3).

infames could not marry freeborn Romans.¹⁸

The paradox of the professions of the stage and arena was that at the same time that these individuals were considered shameful and unworthy of Roman citizenship they were loved and admired by thousands. Although banned from public life, actors and gladiators were nevertheless conspicuous public figures both because of their profession and because of their legal status.¹⁹ Actors and gladiators were so completely devoid of honour that they were used as examples of what proper Romans should avoid, yet at the same time they were admired and even emulated.²⁰

Although *munera* allowed gladiators to attain a publicly acknowledged standard of behaviour which would be impossible for them to achieve elsewhere, they were despised and feared because they earned their living through violence and they were stereotyped as being dangerously attractive to upper-class women.²¹ Both actors and gladiators could become extremely popular but actors seem to have had the ability to climb higher on the social ladder than did gladiators, and on quite a few occasions were friends with members of the upper orders and even with the emperor.²² The popularity of actors and gladiators often resulted in suspicion from members of the upper *ordines*. Actors had the opportunity to speak directly to the Roman

¹⁸ *Dig.* 23.2.44, 48.2.4, 48.5.25.

¹⁹ Edwards 1997, 69.

²⁰ For the voluntary performance of senators and *equites* in the theatre and as gladiators, see Tac. *Ann.* 14.15, 14.20, 15.32; Suet. *Iul.* 39, *Aug.* 43.3, *Tib.* 35.2, *Ner.* 11.1, *Dom.* 8.3; Dio Cass. 51.22.4, 55.10.11, 60.7.1; Juv. 8.183-192. See also Grant (1967, 94-95); Plass (1995); Wiedemann (1995, 106-111); Edwards (1997, 67); Kyle (1998, 80).

²¹ Juv. 6.103-113 and Petron. *Sat.* 126 for example.

²² *SHA Gallieni Duo* 17.7; *Aur.* 50.4; *Carus, Carinus, Numerian* 16.7; Suet. *Calig.* 55.1, *Vesp.* 19,

people and to command their attention, a position usually available only to the political elite and later only to the emperor. This opportunity gave them great political power and caused them, even more than gladiators, to be regarded with fear.²³ From the late Republic onwards the theatre was a venue in which the Roman people could express their views – whether positive or negative – on political and other issues, and an actor could affect the audience's response to those individuals in the top levels of the social hierarchy.²⁴ Actors are known to have been punished or exiled for displeasing those in power, although they were so loved by the *plebs* that they were sometimes recalled.²⁵ The strict definition of actors' and gladiators' place at the very bottom of the social hierarchy can be seen as an attempt to control and diffuse their power and the challenge which they presented to a structured society and those in charge of it.²⁶

Repeated legislation against the efforts of members of the upper *ordines* to perform on the stage or in the arena reveals the disdain with which these professions were regarded as well as the conflicting attitudes towards actors and gladiators.²⁷ In 46 B.C.E. Caesar prevented a senator from fighting at his games but allowed equestrians and the son of a senator to take part, and in 38

Tit. 7.2, Dom. 3.1.

²³ *Cic. Sest.* 56.120-121; *Tac. Ann.* 4.14; *Suet. Vesp.* 19.2; *Ner.* 39.3, 54; see also Levick (1983, 108); Edwards (1993, 118; 1997, 79).

²⁴ *Tac. Ann.* 1.77, 6.13; *Cic. Sest.* 50.106, 56.120-121, 57.123-124; *Tert. Apol.* 38.2; *Plut. Vit. Cic.* 13.2-4; *Suet. Ner.* 39.3, *Galb.* 13, *Vit.* 4. See also Edwards (1993, 100); Csapo and Slater (1995, 318); Parker (1999, 172). At the *ludi Augustales* held the year of Augustus' death a pantomime refused to go on stage until he was offered more money, a demand which the crowd supported (*Tac. Ann.* 1.54.2; *Dio Cass.* 56.47.2).

²⁵ *Dio Cass.* 54.17.4-5; *Tac. Ann.* 4.14, 13.25; *Suet. Tib.* 37.2; *Ner.* 16.2, 39.3. See Jory (1986); Slater (1994).

²⁶ For more on the challenge which actors and gladiators presented to Roman order, see Edwards (1993, 1997); Parker (1999).

²⁷ For the performance of these individuals see Plass (1995); Gunderson (1996, 136-142).

B.C.E. a ban was imposed prohibiting any senator to fight as a gladiator.²⁸ Although the bans of 46 and 38 as recorded by Dio do not mention the stage, his next account of a prohibition in the year 22 B.C.E. reveals that both senators and their sons were already banned from performing on stage. The legislation from this year extended the prohibition from the stage and arena to the grandchildren of senators as well.²⁹ Augustus continued the Republican tradition of legislation against performance by senators on stage and in the arena. He extended the prohibition to their grandchildren in 22 B.C.E. and to *equites* and perhaps upper-class women in the same year.³⁰ By 11 C.E., however, he was forced to lift the prohibition against *equites* because of constant evasions.³¹ In the same year a senatorial decree was passed forbidding public performances by freeborn males under the age of 25 and freeborn women under the age of 20, perhaps in order to prevent young persons from taking advantage of the relaxation of the ban against the *equites* from earlier that year.³²

A *senatus consultum* was passed in 19 C.E. in order to punish members of the *ordo senatorius* and *ordo equester* (equestrians had been allowed to perform from 11 C.E. until this date), as well as members of their families, who deliberately incurred *infamia* in order to perform

²⁸ Dio Cass. 43.23.5, 48.43.2-3.

²⁹ Dio Cass. 54.2.5. It is because senators and their children were already prohibited from the stage by the time of this ban that Levick (1983, 106) suggests that the *senatus consultum* of 38 banned them not only from the arena but also the stage.

³⁰ Dio Cass. 54.2.5.

³¹ Dio Cass. 56.25.7.

³² Although the *senatus consultum* banning the performance of freeborn individuals depending upon age refers only to the arena it should be taken as applying to the stage as well, as had the earlier legislation.

on stage or in the arena free from repercussions.³³ By 19 C.E. senators and their sons had been banned from the stage and the arena since 38 B.C.E. and their grandchildren had been banned since 22; members of the equestrian order and women from senatorial and equestrian families had been forbidden the same since 22 but, because of constant evasion of the ban, *equites* were exempted from this prohibition by a *senatus consultum* of 11 C.E. Freeborn males under the age of 25 and freeborn women under the age of 20 had been banned from giving public performances by a decree passed later that same year. The following individuals were forbidden to perform as an actor or gladiator by the *senatus consultum* of 19 C.E.: a senator's son, daughter, grandson, granddaughter, great-grandson, and great-granddaughter, any man whose father or grandfather (both maternal and paternal) or brother had ever been allowed to sit in seats assigned to *equites* at spectacles, and any woman whose husband, father, or grandfather (both maternal and paternal) or brother had been allowed the same. The prohibitions concerning performance by senators reveal that the interest in these activities was strong enough to be an on-going concern. There are many reasons why members of the elite may have been so eager to become *infames*: financial hardship, the glamour of the profession, the power which an actor or a gladiator could yield over an audience, or the freedom from living the life of a member of an upper *ordo* offered by the lack of social status.³⁴ These individuals added to the social hierarchy among gladiators and freeborn fighters, ranging from the poorest individuals to *equites* and senators, tended to be more popular

³³ This *senatus consultum* is recorded on a fragmentary bronze tablet from Larinum; see in particular Levick (1983); also Malavolta (1978); McGinn (1992).

³⁴ Barton (1993, 47) suggests that members of the upper *ordines* fought in the arena "...as the final

than servile individuals and fights involving members of the *ordo senatorius* and *ordo equester* were extremely popular.³⁵

By legislating who was prohibited from performing on stage and in the arena, the state was effectively declaring who was debased enough to be allowed to perform in a profession considered far beneath senators, equestrians, and their descendants.³⁶ The lowly position of those persons performing or fighting was an important element of the display of the social hierarchy at spectacles. It echoed the low social status of the individuals sitting or standing at the rear of the venue: women, the poor, and slaves. In reality, senators, equestrians, and others who were granted privileged seating near the front of the audience were in a somewhat precarious position, sandwiched between elements of the population that had every reason to dislike them. While the architecture of the venues ensured that individuals from different social levels would not mix while attending spectacles, whether as performers or spectators, the practice of assigning reserved seats in the *cavea* ensured that the different social levels would be reinforced and displayed once spectators had seated themselves.

and ultimate act of a libertine existence, the suicidal culmination of a life of self-indulgence.”

³⁵ Dio Cass. 56.25.8. For discussion of the hierarchy in the arena see Edmondson (1996, 95-97); for the prices of different types of gladiators, presumably according to fighting ability, see Carter (2003).

³⁶ *Venationes*, staged animal hunts held in the arena, were not affected by any such legislation either in the Republic or Imperial period (for example Dio Cass. 48.33.4; Suet. *Aug.* 43.2). Plass (1995, 72) suggests that it was less socially risqué to be a *venator* because the *venatio* was not as important a part of spectacle as was gladiatorial combat; the *venatio* also had the more upper-class associations of hunting. Chariot racing also was not considered beneath the upper *ordines* and even Nero took part (Suet. *Cal.* 28.3; *Ner.* 14.14-15.15.67).

Spectacle as an Opportunity to Challenge the Social Hierarchy

The organization of audiences as it is revealed by seating inscriptions provides insight not only into the disparate social and civic structures of communities throughout the empire, but also into the use of spectator seating arrangements in the creation of a community's self-identity. The presence of these seating inscriptions does not, however, reveal to what extent audiences would have in fact adhered to these idealized representations of local society. Since seating inscriptions are static they can obscure the ways in which audiences chose to structure themselves.³⁷

While this study has focussed on the role of spectacle in displaying and reinforcing the social hierarchy, and on audience organization as a tool of the elite, it will conclude with a brief summary of the opportunities which spectacle offered to challenge the established order.³⁸ The available evidence concentrates only on the city of Rome, but similar situations surely would have arisen in provincial audiences. Literary sources reveal that in spectacular venues in Rome individuals sat in seats that were reserved for others, sometimes because of special permission but far more frequently via unofficial means, and this must have occurred far more often than was ever recorded.³⁹ Incursions into the fourteen equestrian rows are mentioned most often. The people were certainly displeased with the *lex Roscia theatralis* at its introduction, and before Augustus passed legislation allowing anyone whose parents had ever had the equestrian census to

³⁷ van Nijf 1997, 235.

³⁸ For more detailed discussion, see Reinhold (1971); Edwards (1993, 1997); Edmondson (1996, 98-111); Parker (1999).

³⁹ The ancient sources concentrate on the Colosseum but earlier venues are mentioned as well.

sit in the fourteen rows, bankrupt former members of the *ordo* tried to sit there.⁴⁰ Freedmen, soldiers, and others not generally allowed to access these rows are also known to have occupied these seats; often other audience members did not approve even if special permission had been granted to the individual.⁴¹ On occasion these incursions were promoted by the ruler; Caligula, for example, encouraged members of the *plebs* to sit in the equestrian rows by handing out gift tickets early.⁴² By the time of Domitian things had become so disordered in the equestrian area that he had to strictly reinforce the regulations and theatre attendants were put in place to keep an eye on things.⁴³

The close contact between ruler and audience at spectacles in Rome provided the people with an opportunity to make demands concerning a variety of issues to which the ruler sometimes agreed, giving the people at least the appearance of control.⁴⁴ They could demand the manumission of actors, the return of actors from exile, express their sentiments towards those performing or fighting, voice their opinion on legislation, comment on magistrates and members of the imperial house or their companions, complain about the grain supply, and plead personal cases.⁴⁵ These opportunities allowed the *plebs* to challenge the leadership and social prominence

⁴⁰ Plut. *Vit. Cic.* 13; Suet. *Aug.* 40.1; Cic. *Phil.* 2.18.

⁴¹ Schol. on Juv. 5.3; Hor. *Epod.* 4.15-16; Porph. on Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.51-55; Plut. *Vit. Ant.* 59.4; Mart. 5.8, 5.14, 5.23, 5.25; Suet. *Aug.* 14.

⁴² Suet. *Cal.* 26.4.

⁴³ Suet. *Dom.* 8; Mart. 5.8, 5.14, 5.23, 5.25; Juv. *Sat.* 3.153-159. Even into the fourth century individuals were still attempting to sit in seats to which they were not entitled (*CIL* VI 41328-41330).

⁴⁴ An excellent example of the interaction between the audience and the individual responsible for the spectacle outside of Rome is provided by a mosaic found in Smirat depicting the *munerarius* and his response to acclamations by the crowd (Beschtaouch 1966).

⁴⁵ The manumission of actors: Suet. *Tib.* 47.1; Dio Cass. 57.11.6. The return of actors from exile:

of the ruler. The lack of cohesiveness among audience members once they departed from the venue, however, ensured that protests begun in the theatre did not usually have a permanent effect.⁴⁶

Roman spectacle also provided those in power with the opportunity to challenge the social hierarchy of the audience. The ruler sometimes allowed or even encouraged individuals to sit in areas to which they were usually denied access; he could also invite anyone whom he chose to be seated with him.⁴⁷ Those in power were also capable of promoting an individual to a higher status and thereby giving him official entry into a new seating area.⁴⁸ The influence of the ruler could also be negative: members of the upper *ordines* could be forced to perform on stage or in the arena or could be condemned to death via the avenue of the arena.⁴⁹ Individuals of high status could also be publicly humiliated in other ways. Caligula's encouragement to the *plebs* to sit in the equestrian rows would have appalled the *equites*, and Commodus attempted to threaten

Suet. *Aug.* 45; Dio Cass. 54.17.4. Sentiments on those fighting: Diod. Sic. 37.11.12, for example (although this did not always have to involve the ruler). Opinions on legislation: Plut. *Vit. Cic.* 13. Comments on magistrates and other political figures: Cic. *Sest.* 56.120-121, 57.124; Tac. *Ann.* 1.77; Suet. *Tib.* 66.1; *Vit.* 4; Her. 1.12; Dio Cass. 59.13, 72.13.3-4, 74.4.1-4, 75.4.2-7, 79.21.1; *SHA Mac.* 12.7-9; Plut. *Vit. Galb.* 17; Plin. *NH* 34.62. See Whittaker (1964) for discussion of the theatre audience's reaction to Cleander, associate of Commodus. The grain supply: Tac. *Ann.* 6.13. Personal cases: Tac. *Ann.* 3.23; Suet. *Aug.* 27.2; cf. Dio Cass. 47.7.4-5. For general audience and ruler interaction, see Tert. *Apol.* 38.2; Cic. *Sest.* 50.106, 57.123, 5.125; Suet. *Tit.* 8.2.

⁴⁶ Hopkins 1983, 18-19.

⁴⁷ Suet. *Tit.* 9.2, for example.

⁴⁸ At least one freedman was able to sit with the tribunician *viatores* in the seats reserved for *apparitores* (Tac. *Ann.* 16.12); Caligula granted an equestrian procurator the rank of ex-consul, moving him up to the senatorial seats (Dio Cass. 60.23.2), and he also granted an imperial freedman praetorian insignia (Tac. *Ann.* 12.53).

⁴⁹ For members of the *ordo senatorius* and the *ordo equester* forced to perform see Sen. *Controv.* 7.3.9; Dio Cass. 59.10.4; Suet. *Cal.* 35.2-3; *Ner.* 12.1. For condemnation to death in the arena see Suet. *Cal.* 27.3-4; *Dom.* 10.1; Dio Cass. 59.10.

the senators watching him perform by shaking an ostrich head at them (a move which, according to Dio Cassius, was unsuccessful).⁵⁰ It was not only the members of the upper *ordines* whom the ruler attacked. Caligula reportedly had people scourged for not paying attention when his favourite actor Mnester was dancing, ordered individuals standing near the benches at a gladiatorial show to be thrown to the wild beasts in the arena, and removed the *velum* covering the spectators during the heat of the day.⁵¹ Suetonius relates that Domitian once had the owner of a band of gladiators dragged from his seat into the arena.⁵² Such challenges to the social order by the ruler, as they are reported by ancient authors, must have created a sense of unease in the audience. These authors may in fact have been using these reversals of the social order as literary devices to emphasize the negative characteristics of particular emperors. That is, these incidents at spectacles, where the display of the social hierarchy had been so carefully orchestrated from Augustus onward, exemplified the ways in which these emperors had gone astray.

Although members of the upper orders could be forced to perform, many did so voluntarily. Their appearance on the stage or in the arena was a very public affront to the status of senators and equestrians. Emperors themselves were not immune to the desire to perform; Nero loved the stage and chariot-racing and Commodus fought in the arena.⁵³ Although actors and gladiators were *infames* and the desire of individuals in power to perform was seen as

⁵⁰ Suet. *Cal.* 26.4; Dio Cass. 73.21.

⁵¹ Suet. *Cal.* 26.4, 55.1; Dio Cass. 59.10.3.

⁵² Suet. *Dom.* 10.1.

⁵³ For Nero and his love of performance, see Tac. *Ann.* 14.14-15, 14.20-21, 15.33, 15.50, 15.65, 15.67; *Ner.* 20-25, 53-54; also Beacham (1999, 197-254).

morally reprehensible, actors and gladiators could also transcend the social and legal barriers separating them from those watching and could exert control over audience members including political figures and even the emperor himself.

Roman spectacle, both in the city of Rome and in the provinces, brought all levels of society together in close contact with those in power. In Rome the emperor himself was present but his presence was also felt in provincial venues through his symbols and representatives of his regime. It is precisely because the elite used audience organization so effectively to impose an idealized social structure upon those in attendance that spectacles offered valuable opportunities to audience members (including the elite) to challenge the established order.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ As Parker (1999, 163) puts it, "The theatre was a site of contesting identities and power, a place where the elite might be praised or attacked, where status was defined and defended, where social and sexual identity was proved and challenged."

Catalogue of Seating Inscriptions

(abc)	Letters that have been supplied to expand abbreviations
[abc]	Letters lost on the original stone because of damage or weathering but that have been supplied
{abc}	Letters inscribed by the lapicide in error
ABC	Letters that cannot be resolved in a word
abc?	Letters that have been supplied whose accuracy is uncertain
A	A letter whose identification is uncertain
+	An unknown letter
[- - -]	An unknown number of lost letters on the original stone
-----	An entire line lost on the original stone

Those letters that were once legible but now are no longer visible, denoted by an underline, have not been indicated here. The organization of entries by region follows that of *SEG*. Unrelated inscriptions on the same seat or seat block are separated by a semi-colon. Only those inscriptions from the eastern empire that can be securely dated to the Roman period are included here. Texts that comprise merely names or that are indecipherable remain untranslated.

Attica

1. Athens. Theatre of Dionysus. The theatre was constructed in the early 5th c. B.C.E.; the inscriptions are Hadrianic (117-138 C.E.) unless otherwise specified. The *cunei* are identified from left to right. The letters assigned for each inscription indicate the seat blocks from left to right when looking at the *cavea*; those seat blocks that are not listed are either lost or do not carry inscriptions. *IG II 3² 5025-80*; the texts are listed in the same order here except 5080 which is identified as such. For details on the offices listed see Maas (1972, 99-140) and Parker (2005).

1. Middle *cuneus*, row 1

- a) ἱερέως / Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου “(Place of) the priest of Zeus *Olympios*.”
- b) Πυθοορχήτου / ἐξηγητοῦ “(Place of) the interpreter of the Pythian oracle.”
- c) ἱερέως / Διονυσίου Ἐλευθερέως

“(Place of) the priest of Dionysus *Eleuthereos*.” Date: perhaps pre-Hadrianic; inscribed on the middle seat in the first row, an appropriate location for the priest of the god to whom the theatre was dedicated.

d) ἱερέως Διὸς Πολιέως “(Place of) the priest of Zeus *Polieos*.”

e) [- -] θυηχόου “...(sacrificing) priest...”

2. Middle *cuneus*, row 2

b) ἱερέως / Ὀλυμπίας Νίκης “(Place of) the priest of Olympian *Nike*.” This priest was responsible for the games founded by Hadrian.

d) Ἀρδούχου “(Place of) the torch-bearer.”

e) ἱερέως / Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθίου “(Place of) the priest of Pythian Apollo.”

3. Middle *cuneus*, row 3

c) ἱερέως / Δημοκρατίας ; ἱε[ρέως] / Δήμ[ου καὶ] / Χαρί[των] ; [ἱερέως]
Πτολ[εμαίου Εὐεργέτου] κα[ὶ] Β[ερενίκης]

“(Place of) the priest of *Democratia*; (Place of) the priest of the Demos and the Graces; (Place of the priest) of Ptolemy *Euergetes* and Berenike(?)” For the restoration of the third text see Maas 1972, 108-10. Ptolemy III *Euergetes* ruled 246-222 B.C.E.

d) i. στρατηγοῦ “(Place of) the *strategos*.”

ii. κυρία IB IB may be the number 12.

e) κήρυκος “(Place of) the herald.”

4. Middle *cuneus*, row 4

Seat locations not given. Inscriptions date to after 200 C.E. *IG II 3*² 5080.

i. Διογένους / Εὐεργέτου

“(Place of the priest of?) Diogenes the Benefactor.” Diogenes was the Macedonian commander who led his troops out of Athens in 229 B.C.E. after having been paid 150 talents by the Athenians. This seat seems to have been reserved for the priest of the cult of Diogenes, although Mikalson (1998, 172) suggests that it was reserved instead for his eldest male descendant.

ii. ἱερέως / Ἀττάλου / ἑπωνύμου “(Place of) the priest of eponymous (?) Attalus.”

This Attalus appears to be Attalus I *Soter* (241-197 B.C.E.).

5. First *cuneus* on left

All remaining entries for no. 1 are found on the first row of seats unless otherwise indicated.

a) ἱερομνήμονος “(Place of) the magistrate in charge of temples (*hieromnemon*).”

b) ἱερέως / καὶ ἀρχιερέως / Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος

“(Place of) the priest and high priest of Augustus Caesar.” Date: Augustan, although the “high priest” was a later addition (Maas 1972, 116); see Chapter 3.

c) ἱερέως / Ἀδριανοῦ / Ἐλευθεραίως “(Place of) the priest of Hadrian *Eleutheraios*”.
Date: late 2nd to 3rd c.

6. Second *cuneus* on left

a) ἄρχοντος “(Place of) the *archon* (chief magistrate).”

b) βασιλέω[ς] “(Place of) the *basileus* (second of nine *archons*).”

c) πολεμάρχου “(Place of) the *polemarch* (the third *archon*).”

7. Third *cuneus* on left

a) θεσμοθέτου “Place of the *thesmothete* (one of six junior *archons*).”

b) θεσμοθέτου c) θεσμοθέτου d) θεσμοθέτου / Γορ[- -]

e) ἱεροκήρυκο[ς] “(Place of) the sacred herald.”

8. Fourth *cuneus* on left

All seats in the first row have been lost.

9. Fifth *cuneus* on left

d) ἱερέως / Ἰακχάγωγοῦ “(Place of) the priest of Iacchus (Dionysus).”

e) ἱερέως / Ἀσκληπιοῦ / Π[αί]ω<v>ος “(Place of) the priest of Asclepius *Paionos*. ”

10. Sixth *cuneus* on left

a) ἱερέως / πυρφόρου / ἔξ ἄκροπό- / λεως “(Place of) the fire-bearing priest from the acropolis.”

b) ἱερέως Δήμου / καὶ Χαρίτων / καὶ Ῥώμης

“(Place of) the priest of the Demos and the Graces and *Roma*.” Date: Augustan.

c) κήρυκος παναγοῦς / καὶ ἱερέως

“(Place of) the sacrosanct herald and priest...”

11. First *cuneus* on right

a) ἐξηγητοῦ / ἐξ Εὐπατριδῶν χειρο- / τονητοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ / δήμου διὰ βίου

“(Place of) the interpreter (of the Pythian oracle) from the Eupatridae appointed by the demos for life.”

b) ἱερέως Χαρίτων / καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος / Ἐπιπυργιδίας / πυρφόρου

“(Place of) the priest of the Graces and fire-bearing Artemis *Epipurgidia*.”

c) ἱερέως / Ποσειδῶνος / Φυτολμίου

“(Place of) the priest of nourishing Poseidon.”

d) ἱερέως / Ἀπόλλωνος / Δηλίου

“(Place of) the priest of Delian Apollo.”

e) ἱεροφάντου

“(Place of) the hierophant.”

12. Second *cuneus* on right

a) ἱερέως / Διὸς Βουλαίου / καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς / Βουλαίας

“(Place of) the priest of Zeus of the council and Athena of the council.”

b) βουζύγου / ἱερέως Διὸς ἐν / Παλλαδίῳ

“(Place of) the oxen-keeping priest of Zeus in the Palladion.”

c) ἱερέως / Μελπομενοῦ / Διονύσου / ἐξ Εὐνειδῶν

“(Place of) the priest of Dionsysus *Melpomenos* of the Euneidoi.” The Euneidoi appear to have been a *gens* named after, and descendants of, the son of Jason and Hypsipyles that was of particular cultic significance and that was involved in music and religious sacrifices. Dionysus is here represented in his incarnation as the god of song and dance.

d) ἱερέως / Ἀρτέμιδος / Κολαινίδος

“(Place of) the priest of Artemis *Kolainis*.”

e) ἱερέως / Ποσειδῶνος / Γαιήοχου καὶ / Ἐρεχθέως “(Place of) earth-shaking Poseidon and Erectheus.”

13. Third *cuneus* on right

a) ἱερέως / vacat / Εὐκλείας καὶ / Εὐνομίας “(Place of) the priest of Glory and Good Order.”

b) ἱερέως / Διονύσου / Μελπομενοῦ / ἐκ τεχνειτῶν

“(Place of) the priest of Dionysus *Melpomenus* of the theatrical artists.”

c) ἱερέως / Ἀπόλλωνος / Πατρῷο[υ] “(Place of) the priest of Apollo *Patröos*.”

d) ἱερέως / Ἀντινόου / χορείου ἐκ τε- / χνειτῶν

“(Place of) the priest of Antinoos of the Chorus of the theatrical artists.”

di) ἱερίας Ἀθηνᾶς Ἀθηνίου

“(Place of) the priestess of Athena, Athenion.” An Arria Athenion has been identified in Athens (*IG* 2776, 11). This text is located in the second row, directly behind d).

e) ἱερέως / Διὸς {Διὸς} Σωτῆρος / καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Σωτείρας

“(Place of) the priest of Zeus the Saviour and Athena the Saviour.”

14. Fourth *cuneus* on right

a) φαιδυντοῦ / Διὸς ἐκ Πείσης “(Place of) the statue-cleanser of Zeus out of obedience?”

b) ἱερέως / δώδεκα θεῶν “(Place of) the priest of the twelve gods.”

c) ἱερέως Διὸς Φιλίου “(Place of) the priest of Zeus *Philios*.” Date: pre-Hadrianic?

d) ἱερέως / Μουσῶν “(Place of) the priest of the Muses.”

e) ἱερέως / Ἀσκληπιοῦ “(Place of) the priest of Asclepius.”

15. Fifth *cuneus* on right

a) ἱερέως / Ἡφαίστου “(Place of) the priest of Hephaistus.”

b) ἱερέως / Οὐρανίας / Νεμέσεως “(Place of) the priest of Urania Nemesis.”

c) ἱερέως / Ἀνάκων / καὶ Ἡρώος / Ἐπιτεγίου

“(Place of) the priest of the Anakes (Dioscuri) and of Hero *Epitegios*.”

d) φαίδυντοῦ / Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου / ἐν ᾿Αστει “(Place of) the cleanser of Zeus *Olympius* in the city.”

e) ἱερέως / Ἀπόλλωνος Λυκίου

“(Place of) the priest of Apollo *Lukeos*.” The adjective *lukeios*, when used as an epithet for the god Apollo, seems to play upon different meanings: the wolf-slayer (*lukoktonos*), the Lycian god, or the god of light. Date: Augustan.

16. Sixth *cuneus* on right.

a) ἱερέως Δήμητρος / καὶ Φερρεφάτης “(Place of) the priest of Demeter and Persephone.”

b) ἱερέως / Διὸς Τελεί- / ου βουζύγου “(Place of) the priest of Zeus the All-Powerful *Bouzougos*.”

c) ἱερέως / Θησέως “(Place of) the priest of Theseus.”

d) ἱερέως / λιθοφόρου “(Place of) the stone-bearing (?) priest.”

e) ἱερέως / Αὐλωνέως / Διονύσου “(Place of) the priest of Dionysus *Auloneos*.”

f) ἱερέως Ἀπόλλω- / νος Δαφνηφόρου “(Place of) the priest of Apollo *Daphnephoros*.”

2. Athens. Theatre of Dionysus; see above no. 1. The inscriptions are Hadrianic unless otherwise specified. The row in which each inscription is found is indicated but individual seats are not identified and the letters assigned, unlike in no. 1 above, do not indicate seat order. *IG II 3² 5083-5164*; the texts are listed in the same order here. For details on the offices listed see Maas (1972, 99-140) and Parker (2005).

1. Middle *cuneus*

a) Row 2 Η[- 6 -]ιανός b) Row 11 Κολλυ[τέων?]

c) Row 14 [θ]εηκόλων “(Place of) the priest...?”

2. First *cuneus* on left

- a) Row 7 [- - -]έως b) Row 11 λιθοκ<ό>πων “(Place of) the stone-cutters.”
- c) Row 15 παν[- - -]

3. Second *cuneus* on left

- a) Row 3 Θ[ιλή]μονος ; [- - -]λι[- - -]
- b) Row 4 ’Αττικο[Ϝ] “(Place of) Atticus”; this is Herodes Atticus senior.

4. Third *cuneus* on left

- a) Row 3 [- - -]Ν Γαίου

5. Fourth *cuneus* on left

- a) Row 8 Λαδ[α]μή[ας] Date: possibly Augustan.

6. First *cuneus* on right

- a) Row 2 ἱερείας / ’Ηλίου “(Place of) the priestess of Helios.”
- b) Row 2 ἱερέως / Διονύσου “(Place of) the priest of Dionysus.”
- c) Row 3 ἱερή[ας] ε[- - -]’Αν[τ]ωνίας

“(Place of) the priestess...of Antonia”; Antonia is the wife of Drusus who was given divine honours after her death. Date: Augustan.

- d) Row 4 ἱεράς ’Εστίας ἐπ’ ἀκροπόλει καὶ Λειβίας καὶ ’Ιουλία[ς]

“(Place of) the priestess of Hestia on the Acropolis and of Livia and Julia.” Date: Augustan.

- e) Row 4 Φειλείνου

- f) Row 5 ἔρσηφόροις β’ Χλόης Θέμιδος

“(A place for the) two symbol-carriers of Verdant Themis(?)” The number two here seems to mean that enough space was reserved for two individuals holding this office, or perhaps that they took turns occupying the seat.

g) Row 6 ἔρσηφόροις β' Εἰλιθυία<ς> ἐν ἄγραι[ς]

“(A place for the) symbol-carriers of Ilithyia in the hunts(?)” The number two here seems to mean that enough space was reserved for two individuals holding this office, or perhaps that they took turns occupying the seat.

h) Row 7 ὕμνητριῶν υσ[- - - νύ?]μφης “(Place of) the hymn-singers...”

i) Row 8 Ὀλβίας ἱερῆας / καθ' ὑπομνημ[α]τισμὸν καὶ κατὰ / ψήφισμα Ἰουλίας
τῆς [- - -]θ[-]μα[- - -]κο[υ] θυγατρὸς

(Place of) the blessed priestess, according to a decree and a vote, of Julia, daughter...” Date: Augustan.

j) Row 9 ἱερείας Ἑστ[είας] Ρω[μαίων] “(Place of) the priestess of Hestia of the Romans.”

k) Row 10 ὀληφόρου Ἀθηνᾶς Θέμιδος “(Place of) the barley-carrier of Athena *Themis*.”

l) Row 11 Θιλίππης Μηδίου θυγατρὸς “(Place of) Philippa, the daughter of Medeus.”
Date: Augustan.

m) Row 12 Μεγίστης κατὰ ψήφι[σμα] “(Place of) Megista by vote.”

n) Row 13 [- - -]ε Κεφαλῆθεν At a later date Φαλήριος was superinscribed.

o) Row 14 Μεγίσ[της] κατὰ ψήφισμα “(Place of) Megista by vote.”

p) Row 15 [- - -]ιοστροβ[- - -]

q) Row 20 ἱερέως Θέ[μιδος?] “(Place of) the priest of Themis(?)”

r) Row 20 Δαμα[- - -]κ[- - -]ιος

7. Second *cuneus* on right.

a) Row 2 ἱεροφά[ν]τ[ου] / Ἀ[λ]εξ[άνδρου?]

“(Place of) the hierophant of Alexander *or* of the hierophant Alexander?”

b) Row 3 [- - -]αιριτιδος α[- - -]κοσ[- - -]

c) Row 4 A[- -] Διώνης / πον[- -]

d) Row 6 ἱερέως θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος]

“(Place of) the priest of Divine *Roma* and of Augustus Caesar.”

e) Row 6 ῬΑ[φροδί]τη[ς] ἐ[π]ιτραγίας “(Place of)...Aphrodite *Epitragias*.”

f) Row 6 ῬΑρτέμιδος Οἰναίας “(Place of)...Oenoëan Artemis (related to the deme Oenoë).”

g) Row 6 Δήμητρος ῬΑχ[αίας] “(Place of)...Achaean Demeter.”

h) Row 7 Κανηφόροις γ' ἀπὸ Παλλαδί[ου] “(A place for) the three basket-carriers from the Palladium”; cf. 6f, g.

i) Row 8 ῬΑφ[ροδ]ί[τ]η[ς] Κωλιάδ[ος] κα[ὶ] - -]α[- -]

“(Place of)...Aphrodite from Colias and...”

j) Row 8 ῬΑθηναῖς ῬΗε[τιώνης] “(Place of) Athena *Aetiona* (?)”

k) Row 9 κατὰ ψήφισμα γ[- 5 -]μ[- 5 -]ηας / Λαμιδίου “...by vote...Lamidios...”

l) Row 10 ῬΑλκίας ῬΑ[ττικοῦ?] / ῬΑλκίας κα[τ]ὰ ψήφισμα [καὶ ὑπομνηματι?]ζμ[όν?]

“(Place of) Alcias wife of Atticus, Alcias according to vote and decree (?).” Alcias was the wife of Herodes Atticus senior.

m) Row 11 Λαδομήας τῆς Μη[δήου?] “(Place of) Ladamea, the daughter (or wife?) of Medeus.” Date: possibly Augustan.

o) Row 12 Λαμιδίου [κα]τὰ [ψ]ή[φισμα] “(Place of) Lamidius by vote.”

p) Row 13 ἱερέας Κλεαρίστ[ης] “(Place of) the priestess Klearista.”

q) Row 14 ἱερέως Διονύσ[ου] “(Place of) the priest of Dionysus.”

r) Row 15 ῬΑντωνί[ας] “(Place of)...Antonia (?)”

8. Third *cuneus* on right

- a) Row 2 στεφα[νηφόρου] “(Place of) the crown-bearer.”
- b) Row 2 [ύμ]νητριῶν Φιλιδίου “(Place of) the hymn-singers of Philidios.”
- c) Row 3 Δήμ[η]τρος Χλόη[ς ἱερέ]ας ; Διοφά[ν]του
 “(Place of) the priestess of verdant Demeter ; (place of) Diophantus.”
- d) Row 4 ἱερίας Γῆς Θέμιδος “(Place of) the priestess of Earth *Themis*.”
- e) Row 5 ὕμνητριάς [ἱερ]ίας Κου[ρ]οτρόφου Δήμ[η]τρος Πειθοῦς / [- - -]α[- - -]
 “(Place of) the hymn-singer priestess of child-rearing Demeter *Peithos*.”
- f) Row 6 Θ[εσ]μοφόρου “(Place of)...the law-giver(?)” *Thesmophoros* is an
 epithet of the goddess Demeter.
- g) Row 6 [- - -]αι[- - -] / [ἱερ]ήας Οἰνάνθη[ς]
 “(Place of)...the priestess of the vine.” Date: Augustan.
- h) Row 7 Μητρὸς θε[ῶν?]
 “(Place of) the mother of the gods(?)”
- i) Row 8 [- - -]δαπῶν
- j) Row 8 [Δ]ημήτ[ρος Θ]εσμοφόρο[υ] “(Place of)...Demeter *Thesmophoros*.”
- k) Row 8 Μοιρῶν “(Place of)...the Fates.”

9. Third *cuneus* on right

- a) Row 10 Μεγιστ[ης κατὰ] ψή[φ]ισμα “(Place of) Megista by vote.”
- b) Row 11 Παρν[- - -]
- c) Row 12 Στρα[- - -] ; [᾿Αρτέμιδος Κολαινίδος “(Place of) Artemis *Kolainis*.”
- d) Row 13 [ἱ]ερέα[ς - - -] “(Place of) the priestess...” Date: Augustan.

e) Row 14 Ἰου[- - -] Διονύσου Λ[- - -] “...of Dionysus...”

f) Row 16 [- - -] ἐν Ῥαμ[νοῦντι] “...at Rhamnus (a deme in Attica).”

g) Row 17 Ἀντιόχου h) Row 18 ΟΓ(- - -?)

10. Fourth *cuneus* on right

a) Row 4 ἱερίας Ἑσ[τ]ίας Ῥ[ω]μαίων “(Place of) the priestess of Hestia of the Romans.”

b) Row 5 [Ἀρτ]έμιδος ἐν α[- - -] ; Δαδοφόρου ἐμ Πειρα[ιεῖ]

“(Place of)...Artemis in ...” ; “(Place of) the torch-bearer in the Piraeus.”

c) Row 7 [- - -] Αἰδοῦς “(Place of)...Reverence(?)”

d) Row 8 [Ἀφροδίτ]ης ἐπιτρα[γ]ί[ας] ; Ἥρας ἐλλιμενίας

“(Place of) Aphrodite *Epitragia*” ; “(Place of) Hera *Ellimenia*.”

e) Row 9 [ἱερ]έ[ας] Ἀφρ[ο]δίτ[ης] πανδήμου νύμφης [- - -]ι[-θ]ο[-]η[- - -]

“(Place of) the priestess of the maiden (?) Aphrodite *Pandemos*.”

f) Row 9 Ἥβης “(Place of)...Hebe.”

g) Row 10 δειπνοφόρο[ις] κατὰ ψήφισμα καὶ καθ’ ὑπομνη[μ] / [ατ]ιζμ[όν] ; [- - -]ενο[- - -]

“(A place for) the individuals carrying meat offerings according to vote and to decree.”

h) Row 11 Κουροτρόφου ἐξ Ἀγλαύρου ; Δήμη<τ>ρος

“(Place of) the Child-rearer of (the cult of?) Auglaurus” ; “(Place of) Demeter.” Aglaurus, one of the daughters of Cecrops, was worshipped on the Acropolis.

i) Row 12 Δ[ήμητ]ρος Κουροτρόφου Ἀχάϊας “(Place of) Achaean Child-rearer Demeter.”

j) Row 12 Ἥβης “(Place of)...Hebe.”

k) Row 13 Δήμητρ[ος] Φρεαρόο[υ] “(Place of) Demeter *Phrearoos*.”

l) Row 14 Φλαουίας [- - -] / ἱερέας Λητοῦς καὶ Ἀρ[τέμιδος]

“(Place of)...Flavia...the priestess of Leto and of Artemis.” Date: Augustan.

m) Row 17 [- - -]ηας

11. Fifth cuneus on right

a) Row 2 [- - -]μεν[- - -]θ

b) Row 3 Ποσ[ειδῶνος] “(Place of)...Poseidon.”

c) Row 4 Ζακόρου Διο[κλέους] / Ἰων[- - -]

“(Place of) the attendant in the temple of Diokleus (an Eleusinian hero).”

d) Row 5 [Πεντε?]τηρίδ[ος?] ; [- - -]νας The first text may be referring to a penteteric festival.

e) Row 10 Λειβίας f) Row 11 [- - -]κράτας

g) Row 14 Ἀ[θ]ονᾶς h) Row 16 θεοξένας

12. Sixth cuneus on right

a) Row 2 θ[ε]ανῶ b) Row 3 [- - -]τ[- - -]

c) Row 4 [- - -]αμι[- - -]λ

3. Athens. Theatre of Dionysus; see above no. 1. Seat, original location unknown. The inscription is Hadrianic or later. *IG II 3² 5081*.

ἱερέως / Ἀπόλλωνος / Ζωστηρίου

“(Place of) the priest of Apollo from Zoster (a place on the west coast of Attica).”

4. Athens. Theatre of Dionysus; see above no. 1. On a seat found in the orchestra whose original location is unknown. The inscription is Hadrianic or later. *IG II 3² 5082*.

καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος “...and of Apollo...”

Arcadia

5. Megalopolis. Theatre seats. The theatre was originally constructed in the early 4th c. B.C.E.; these inscriptions have been dated to between the late 1st c. B.C.E. and the time of Hadrian. The number provided indicates the *cuneus* number in front of which the seats of honour were found in the front row; those seats not included (1, 2, 8, 9) were free of inscriptions. *IG V.2.452*; Richards 1892, 125-126; Fiechter 1931, 23 no. 3.

- 3 φυλῆ Μ[αιναλ]ιῶν “The tribe Mainalioi.”
- 4 φυ(λῆ) Λυκαειτῶν “(Place of?) the tribe Lykaeitali.”
- 5 φυλῆς Παρρασίων “(Place of) the tribe Parrhasioi.”
- 6 φυ(λῆ) Πανιατῶν “(Place of?) the tribe Paniatai.”
- 7 φυ(λῆ) Ἀπολλων[νια]τῶν “(Place of?) the tribe Apolloniatai.”

There are earlier tribal inscriptions in the theatre; the texts above were inscribed as the names of the tribes changed.

Delphi

6. Delphi. Theatre seats. The theatre was originally constructed in the early 3rd c. B.C.E.; the inscriptions are Roman in date. The *cunei*, of which there are seven in total, are identified from east to west; only *cunei* 2, 6, and 7 carry inscriptions. All texts are found on the horizontal face of the seats unless otherwise indicated. Valmin 1939, 1-6, nos. 1-3; Dilke 1948, 184.

Cuneus 2

- | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Row 13 | [- - -]ΒΑΟΒΟΟΥΙΚΟΥΣ | 2. Row 13 | [- - -]μάχου |
| 3. Row 14 | [- - -]Κ[- - -]Β[- - -]Β | 4. Row 14, rise | [- - -]Λ[- - -]ΥΟ[- - -]ΦΥ[- - -]Η |
| 5. Row 15 | [- - -]Υ Εὐδίκ[ου] | | |
| 6. Row 15, rise | [- - -]Υ[- - -]Ο[- - -]Η[- - -]Η | | |
| 7. Row 16, rise | [- - -]Π[- - -]Ο[- - -]Λ | | |

8. Row 17, rise [- - -]M[- - -]HOΛ[- - -]HΛ

9. Row 19 [- - -]BO

10. Row 19, rise [- - -]Π

11. Row 20 [- - -?]Βου[λ]ᾱ[ς] NO[- - -]A

12. Row 21 [- - -?]Βουλᾱ[ς] ENO[- - -]A

Although nos. 11 and 12 could be the ends of personal names, Valmin (2) suggests that these inscriptions may instead be referring to the local town council. Their position far away from the front of the *cuneus* does not, however, correspond with the privileged seating assigned to the members of the council elsewhere.

Cuneus 6

13. Row 4 Ἄρχηίδος Λούπης “(Place of) the priestess Lupa.”

14. Row 5 Ἄρχηίδο[ς] Λούπη[ς] “(Place of) the priestess Lupa.”

This woman's full name is Μεμμία Λούπα, and in this *cuneus* seats are reserved for her by name and title in rows 4, 5, 10; her name may also be inscribed on a seat that was found by the east *parodos* wall (below, no. 39). In rows 5, 13, and 14 the name Μεμμία is found, suggesting that a large portion of this *cuneus* may have been reserved for the family as a whole. Μεμμία Λούπα lived near the end of the 1st c. B.C.E.; for discussion of her family see Valmin (4). The title of priestess is also found in rows 6, 7, 8, and 9.

15. Row 5, rise [- - -?] M[ε]μμί[α]ς ΜΟΝΥΑΘΟΥΩΔΣΑΟΗΣΔΙΑ[-]Η[-]ΦΟΠΙΟΣ

16. Row 6 Ἄρχηίδος “(Place of) the priestess...”

17. Row 6, rise [- - -]Π[-]ΥΣΗΩΙΟΗΩΩΟΙΑΟΚΛΗΑΣ

18. Row 7 Ἄρχηίδος “(Place of) the priestess...”

19. Row 8 Ἄρχηίδος “(Place of) the priestess...”

20. Row 9 Ἄρχηίδος “(Place of) the priestess...”

21. Row 9, rise Κορνηλί(α)ς ΕΥ

22. Row 10 Ἄρχηίδος Λούπης “(Place of) the priestess Lupa.”

23. Row 10, rise [- - -]NH[-]ΙΑΣ[-]ΕΥ[- - -]ΠΑΤΙΑΣ

24. Row 11 [---]Π[---]ΚΟ 25. Row 12 [---]Π[---]Κ
26. Row 12, rise [---]ΔΑΡΑΜΠΗΟΔΟΙΙΙΙ
27. Row 13 [---]Π[---]Κ
28. Row 13, rise ᾿Αμφικτυόνων [---]ΟΣ[---] Μεμμία[ζ---]ΛΕΑΣ

“(Place of) the Amphictyons...(Place of?) Memmia...” It is surprising to find seats for the Amphictyons, members of the council designated by the Amphictyonic League, this far back in the *cavea*. Their historical importance at Delphi would suggest that they should instead have seats at the front of the audience (see, for example, Bonner and Smith 1943). Valmin (4) suggests that they had some connection with the Μεμμία family, whose name is mentioned in the same row. A large portion of this *cuneus* seems to have been reserved for the family; see no. 14 above.

29. Row 14 [---]Π
30. Row 14, rise Μ[ε]μ[ί]α[ς] ΜΝΑΩΦΣ[---]Ι[---]Σ
31. Row 15, rise [---]κοι[ο]Φ[---]Ο
32. Row 16, rise [---]Η
33. Row 17, rise [---]Ω[---]ΣΟ
34. Found *ex situ* in the external wall of the *cuneus* [---?]Η[---]Ο[---]Ι
35. Found *ex situ* in the external wall of the *cuneus* [---]Τ[---?]

Cuneus 7

36. Row 5 ΤΟΥΝ[---]Α 37. Row 5, rise [---]Ι
37. Row 17 [---]Ο
38. Found *ex situ* [---]ΛΙΑΘ Α(---?)

Fragments Found Outside of Theatre

39. The eastern *parodos* wall [---]Λ Ο Α Ι Η Σ vel [---] Λούρης

40. The western *parodos* wall [- - -]ΤΟ[- - -]ΙΟ

Macedonia

7. Stobi. Theatre. The theatre was built at beginning of the 2nd c. C.E; the inscriptions date from the late 2nd to perhaps the 4th c. C.E. The *cunei* are identified from the left; seating block numbers provided include stairway blocks and are given from the left or right (facing the *cavea*) depending upon the condition of the row. Row references are given from the bottom unless otherwise indicated. Saria 1940, nos. 1-167; this list corresponds to his, although his catalogue is in places difficult to interpret. References to Wiseman refer to catalogue entry no. 8 below.

1st cuneus from left

1. Row 2, block 4 from right Λουκίου / Κυντι(- - -?)

The two inscriptions appear to be unrelated, since the second line is in a much larger script.

2. Row 2, block 3 from right

Φ[- - -?]νιου / Ποβλ(ιου?) ΣΕΠΙ(- - -?) / Παυλου / Αίλί(ου?) Σ[- - -]Λ[- - -?]

3. Row 2, block 2 from right

Κουντιλι(- - -?) / Κορη / Παυλι(- - -?) ᾽Αγαθοκλεος / Λ[- - -?]

Each line appears to be unrelated to the next; Παυλι and ᾽Αγαθοκλεος have been inscribed over one another, although it is not clear which is the earlier inscription.

4. Row 2, block 1 from right ᾽Ενανας ; Σ[- - -?]

5. Row 3, block 3 from right Ου+βι(- - -?) / Λε(- - -?) ; Ούλ[- - -?]

6. Row 3, block 2 from right ᾽Επιθυμητου Υ(- - -?) ; Γαίο(υ)/Σαβεινου

7. Row 3, block 1 from right Λουκίου

8. Row 4, block 5 from left φυλῆς Ουαλέριας “(Place of) the tribe *Valeria*.”

9. Row 4, block 4 from left φυλ(ῆς) Μαρτίας; Αὐ(λου?); Γαί(ου?) / Κοι(- - -)

“(Place of) the tribe *Martia*.”

10. Row 4, block 3 from left φυ(λῆς?) [- - -] “(Place of) the tribe...”

11. Row 5, block 2 from left Φι(- - -) ; Οὐαλ(έριας?) ; φυ(λῆς) Κ[λαυδ]ία

“... (Place of the tribe) *Valeria*”; “(Place of) the tribe *Claudia*.” In his list of the 6 tribes of Stobi whose names are inscribed on theatre seats, Wiseman (1984, 578 n. 63) identifies a tribe *Cl[audi]a*, to which this inscription may be referring.

12. Row 5, block 3 from left Δι(- - -) ; Β(- - -)

13. Row 5, block 4 from left Ου(- - -)

14. Row 6, block 4 from right A monogram composed of an H and two Ps at the top of each vertical line of the H.

15. Row 6, block 3 from right Ου(- - -)

16. Row 7, block 2? from left

Γ(αίου?) Π(- - -) ΕΥ(- - -) ; ΧΙ(- - -?) / ΠΙΠΙ(- - -) vel Π(- - -) Ρ(- - -) Ι(- - -) / [- - -?]ΕΙΒ(- - -) ΒΛΟ(- - -) ; Εὐχα(- - -) ; Πρεπ(- - -)

17. Row 7, block 3 from right [- - - ο?]Υ Κορχ(- - -) / ’Ιούλι(ου?)

18. Row 7, block 2 from right [- - -?]ΕΙΟΥ ; ΕWK / ΟVI ; Λου(κίου?)

19. Row 8, block 4 from right

ΛΕ(- - -) ; Ε+Ο ; Εὐτυ(χου?) / Τ(- - -?) Ν(- - -?) Ε(- - -?) ; Κ(- - -?) / Εἰθαγενων

20. Row 8, block 2 from right Πο(υβλίου?) Αἰ(λίου?)

21. Row 9, block 1 from left Κρατοαυμου / Γαίου ; Οὐα[- - -] ; ΔW(- - -?)

22. Row 9, block 3 from right Οὐαριων

23. Row 9, block 2 from right Ἰουλιανῶν καὶ
24. Row 9, block 1 from right Πετιλλίου Γαίανου
25. Row 10, block 1 from left Κρατῶνους ; Πομπωτηριχοῦ Γ(- - -)
26. Row 10, block 2 from left Λειβί(ο)υ
27. Row 10, block 3 from left [Σ]εκουνῶ[υ]

It is possible that the lambda is in fact a delta, making this [Σ]εκούνδο[υ].

28. Row 10, block 4 from left I(- - -) O(- - -) ; NOYM+

NOYM+ does not seem to be related to the first two texts.

29. Row 10, block 5 from left

Νει(κίου?) ; Νει(κίου?) ; Νεικίου ; B(- - -) ; +A(- - -) ; Λυ(κίου?) Φ(- - -) ;
KPI(- - -) ; [- - -?]NOYY E[- - -] ; Ου(- - -) Ο(- - -) Φοιπ+(- - -)

30. Row 11, block 1 from left Προ[- - -]
31. Row 11, block 2 from left Φουλ(κινίου?)
32. Row 11, block 5 from left Σεκ(ούνδου?) Ο(- - -) Π(- - -) vel ΟΠ(- - -)
33. Row 11, block 7 from left [- - -?]Μ(- - -)
34. Row 12, block 2 from left

Αλεξά(νδρου?) ; Ποητιου Μ(- - -) / Ἰανου ; Γρανωνίου / Ἀλεξ(άνδρου?)
[-]Υ ΒΕΙ(- - -) / Πομπον(ίου) / Σικε[δ?]ωνου

35. Row 12, block 3 from left ΟΥΚ(- - -?) ; Γαίου ; ΟΠ(- - -?) ; Λ(- - -?)
36. Row 12, block 5 from left Νικο(- - -)

37. Row 12, block 6 from left Ζωει(λου?) Ερμα(---) ; Λεωνι(δου?) / Ποσιδω(νίου?)
38. Row 12, rise of an unknown block ΚΛΕΠ(---?) C(---?) Μ(---)
39. Row 13, block 5 from right Υλλου ; Υλλ(ου?)
40. Row 13, block 2 from right Προκ(λου?) / ΓΕ(---) vel Γ(---) Ε(---) ; Η(---) Ρ(---) Κ(---) vel 'Ηρ(α)κ(λείδου)?
41. Row 13, block 1 from right [---?]ΠΙΟΥ(---?)
42. Row 14, block 3 from right ΔΙ(---) / ΟΥ(---?) Ε(---)
43. Row 14, block 2 from right Λεων(ιδου?) 'Ακυλου ΣΕ(---)
44. Row 15, block 3 from right Διον(υσίου?) ΜΑ(---) vel Μ(---) Α(---) ; Γαί(ο)υ
45. Row 15, block 5 from right Ουιλθηω+α[---?]
46. Row 15, blocks 3 and 2 from right Καλλι(---) Διονυ(σίου?) Ε[---]ΛΕ
47. Row 16, block 2 from right
Αίλί(ου) Τερτι(ου) Ούλπί(ου) Ε(---) ΑΓ(---) vel Α(---) Γ(---)
48. Row 16, block 1 from right Π(---) Μ(---)
49. No longer *in situ* Εὐτυχου / [---?]ΟΝΙ[---?]ΔΟ
- 2nd cuneus from left
50. Row 2, block 2 from left [---?]Σ(---?) ; Α(---)
51. Row 2, block 3 from left Ε(---); [Κ]ουντιλια(νοῦ) / Ν(---) Τ(---) Ι(---)
52. Row 3, block 2 from left ΒΙΒΙΑ(---?) / Α(---) Λ(---) ; Π(---?) Σ(---?) ; Α†
53. Row 3, block 3 from left Κuí(ντου?) ΑΛΕ(---?) / [---?] ΒΑΟΥ

54. Row 3, block 4 from left Μάρκου
55. Row 3, block 5 from left Τουλίου ; Λουκίου Πουβλικίου Σερβ(ιλίου?)
56. Row 3, block 6 from left Μάρκου; Φ(- - -) Μ(- - -) Υ(- - -); Σερ(βιλίου?)
57. Row 3, block 2 from left; Wiseman (1984, 578 n. 60)
- Ν(- - -) / [- - -]ου Τίτου τόπος “...Place of ...Titus.”
58. Row 4, block 2 from left A monogram that seems to include a Φ, Ν, Ρ and perhaps an Α.
59. Row 4, block 3 from left A monogram that includes a Φ, Υ, Κ, and perhaps another letter; another monogram that includes a Φ and an Ρ.
60. Row 4, block 4 from left, in large letters; Wiseman 1984, 582 and n. 83
- Σιλβανοῦ This text is carved across most of the row.
61. Row 4, block 5 from left
- Γα(ίου?) vel Γ(- - -) Α(- - -); φυ(λῆς?); C(- - -) / Α(- - -); φυλῆ(ς) / [Μερκ]ουρίας
Η(- - -)
- “(Place of) the tribe...”; “(Place of) the tribe *Mercuria*...”
62. Row 4, block 6 from left Αὔ(λου?) Βιτου(- - -?)
63. Row 5, block 1 from left Οὐαλε(ρίου?) ΟΥ(- - -?)
- The final ΟΥ may in fact be the genitive singular ending: Οὐαλε(ρί)ου.
64. Row 5, block 2 from left
- Α(- - -?) Α(- - -?); monogram including Τ, Υ, Υ, Ο, Υ, and perhaps another letter; another monogram including Ε, W, Τ, and perhaps Ο and Ι.

65. Original location unknown Z(---) ME(---) vel Z(---) M(---) E(---)

The zeta is much larger than the other two letters and seems unrelated.

66. Row 5, block 3 from left [- - -?]NOY(---?)

67. Row 5, block 4 from left ΦAIN(---)/ΣΤ(---) Λ(---)

68. Row 5, blocks 2 and 3 from left ΡΟΔΙ(---)/Μόρκου

69. Row 5, original location unknown ΠΑ(---)/Π(---)

70. Row 6, block 1 from left ΛΕ(---) Ἰουλεία

71. Row 6, block 2 from left Α(---) Γ(---) Τ(---); Εὐβι(ό)του?

72. Row 6, block 3 from left Monogram including an P, W, and either a T or X; could be the chi-rho monogram on an angle.

73. Row 6, block 4 from left Πο(υβλίου?) Μαξιμει(λ)ιανου

These texts are prefaced by the image of a bull's head.

74. Row 6, block 5 from left Ζωειλου

75. Row 6, unknown block Φα[---]ιου / ΖΟ[---?]

76. Row 6, unknown block ΠΕ(---) vel Π(---) Ε(---)

77. Row 7, block 2 from left ΕΥΤΡ(---)

78. Row 7, block 3 from left ΚΑ(---)

79. Row 7, block 4 from left Π(---); Κ(---) Σ(---) W(---) vel Κ(---) ΣW(---)

80. Row 7, block 5 from left ΣΥ(---); Δομεν(τιανου?) / ΜΑ(---); ΘΑΔΑ(---)

81. Row 7, block 6 from left Γ(---) Μ(---) Α(---) vel Γ(---) ΜΑ(---);
Ι[---]Α[---]Ν[---]

82. Row 7, unknown block OB(- - -)
83. Row 8, block 2 from left ΕΥ(- - -) ; Γ[- - -]ΟΝΦΙΙ

It is possible that the second inscription is two texts: Γ(αι?)ου and ΦΙΙ.

84. Row 8, block 4 from left 'Ιούστου
85. Row 8, block 5 from left ΛΑΥΣΑΣΙ[- - ?]ΑΝΟΣ
86. Row 8, block 6 from left Π(ουβλίου?) 'Αντονίνου
87. Row 8, block 7 from left [-]ΑΧΙ[-]ΑΓ ; Πομπαια Μομου
88. Row 9, block 2 from left Λ(ουκίου?) 'Οκτα(βιοῦ?)
89. Row 9, block 3 from left Ι(ουλίου?)'Οκταβιαν{ν}οῦ / ΒΤΛΠ ; Κορνηλίου ; 'Αννιος ; [-]ΑΡ ΣΣΠ
90. Row 9, blocks 2 and 3 from left Γαί(ου?)
91. Row 9, block 4 from left 'Ιππολυτου / Γα(ίου?); [Τρ?]αιανου Η(- - -)
92. Row 10, block 1 from left Θ(- - -) vel Ο(- - -)
93. Row 10, block 3 from left ΠΟ(- - -) Μ(- - -) ; Λουκίου
94. Row 10, block 4 from left ΑΙΓΑΙΜΟΠΕ[- - ?]ΦΟΥ
95. Row 10, unknown block [-]ΟΙΟΦ / ΠΛ(- - -?)
96. Row 10, unknown block ΒΙΒΙΜ(- - -?) Α(- - -)
97. Row 11, block 2 from left ΚΛΩΠ(- - -?)
98. Row 11, block 3 from left Ου(- - -) ; ΝΙΔ(- - -) ; Μ(- - -)
99. Row 11, block 1 from right Η(- - -)

100. Row 11, unknown block A(- - -)
101. Row 12, block 1 from left ΚΛW(- - -) vel K(- - -) Λ(- - -) W(- - -); Υ(- - -)
Γαβιδιος
102. Row 12, block 2 from left Σεκ(ούνδου?) Σεκού(νδου?) / Σεκ(ούνδου?)
103. Row 12, block 3 from left
I(- - -?) T(- - -?) ; Κορν(ηλίου) Μαξι(μου?) ; I(- - -) Υ(- - -) E(- - -) Monogram of M, A,
and perhaps Δ ; M(- - -) A(- - -) vel MA(- - -) ; Εὐτυχου
104. Row 12, block 4 from left ΘΑ(- - -) Λ(- - -) Λ(- - -)
105. Row 12, block 5 from left ΜΑ(- - -) vel M(- - -) Α(- - -)
106. Row 13, block 1 from left
Γρα(νίου?) Π(ουβλίου?) Γ(ρανίου?) ; Ο(- - -) ΕΣ(- - -?) ; Μαξι(μου)
107. Row 13, block 2 from left ΧΑ(- - -) ΦΟΥ(- - -)
108. Row 13, block 3 from left ΤΥ(- - -)
109. Row 13, block 4 from left ΜΟΥΙ(- - -) ; Υ(- - -) ; Γράν[ι?]ου
110. Row 13, block 5 from left ΠΟΥ(- - -)
- Wiseman (1984, 581 n. 79) suggests Που(βλίου) (Γρανίου) as an expansion; cf. no. 106.
111. Row 13, block 7 from left Ἑρω(δου?)
112. Row 14, block 1 from left Α(- - -) ΒΙΚΤΩ(- - -?)
113. Row 14, block 2 from left ΧΑ(- - -) ; Πρόκλου / Πετιλλι(ου) / Πρόκλ(ου) /
ΔΙΟ(- - -)

The second group of inscriptions may in fact be on the same line; Saria's catalogue does not make their location clear.

114. Row 14, block 3 from left M(άρκου?) Σεπτιμίου
115. Row 14, block 5 from left Ἴο(υ)κουνδου
116. Row 14, block 6 from left Οὐλ(πιος) Ἑρμοδης; Πετιλλιος; ΕΥ(- - -) Γαί(ου)
117. Row 14, block 7 from left
ΕΠΙΚΤΑΣ; AP(- - -) H(- - -); Monogram of K, Π, and either A or a Δ
118. Row 15, block 1 from left ΓΕ(- - -); T(- - -) M(- - -) Σ (- - -)
119. Row 15, block 2 from left Λ(- - -) K(- - -)
120. Row 15, block 3 from left [- - -]Ι[ου?]κουνδου ΟΥ(- - -); EC(- - -) Σ (- - -)
Φονων(- - -?); Λ(ουκίου?) Σεκούν(δου?)
121. Row 15, block 4 from left [- - -?]ΝΟΥ(- - -?)
122. Row 15, block 5 from left Μακε[δονι?]ου ΝΙ(- - -); Μαξι(μείνου?) Ημείνου?
123. Row 15, block 7 from left ΓΕ(- - -) vel Γ(- - -) Ε(- - -); Ἑρω(δου vel δης?)
124. Row 16, block 1 from left Πρεΐμου
125. Row 16, block 2 from left Πρωτογενου
126. Row 16, block 3 from left Π(ουβλίου?) Καρπος
127. Row 16, block 4 from left Καπ(ίτων?) Καπ(ίτων?)
128. Row 16, block 5 from left ΠΑ(- - -)
129. Row 16, block 6 from left Λου(κίου?)
130. Row 17, block 2 from right Ρ(- - -)

3rd cuneus from left

131. Row 3 ΛΑ(- - -) 132. Row 4 Φ(υλῆς?) “(Place of) the tribe...”
133. Row 5 ΕΥ(- - -) 134. Row 6 CW(- - -) ’Ιου(λίου?)
135. Row 9 Ηρ(ωδου vel ωδης)? 136. Row 10 ΟΥ(- - -)
137. Row 13 ΣΑ(- - -)
138. Row 14 L(- - -) VE(- - -) As published by Saria, this text is in the Latin alphabet.
139. Row 15 ΣΑΛ[- - -]ΛΟ(- - -?) 140. Row 16 +Ουλ(ιανου?) Σεκού(νδου?)

Seats no longer in the theatre

141. Found to the east of the basilica ’Ιουλιανοῦ
142. Found to the east of the basilica Γαίου
143. Found in the chapel of the basilica ΚΑ(- - -)
144. Found in the chapel of the basilica ΤΟ(- - -)
145. Found in the chapel of the basilica Α(- - -)
146. Found in the basilica, near the apse ΠΟ(- - -) ΔΙΟ(- - -)
147. Found in basilica, between the left and the middle aisles
- ΠΑΡ(- - -) vel Π(- - -) Α(- - -) Ρ(- - -) ’ Ιουλίανος ’Ιου(λίου vel λίου?) ΛΟ(- - -)
- ΙΙ(- - -)
148. Found in the basilica, between the left and the middle aisles
- Λοκίου(?) Κορ(νηλίου?) Τίτου
149. Found in the basilica, in the right aisle Λου(κίου?) [- - -]ου ΠΡΟ(- - -) Ι[- - -]
150. Original location unknown [- - -]ΙΟΥΦΙΛΕ vel [- - -]ιου Φιλε(- - -)

8. Stobi. Theatre seats; see above no. 7. The following texts were discovered after the publication of Saria's 1940 article. The full publication of the *cavea* inscriptions by J. Wiseman is forthcoming in a volume on the theatre of Stobi edited by E. Gebhard. All *cuneus* designations are from the left facing the *cavea* and rows are designated from the bottom. Unlike Saria, Wiseman does not include the first row of *prohedria* in his row identification meaning that his references are a row below Saria's (cat no. 7 above); they have been adjusted accordingly here.

1. *Cuneus* 2, row 3, seat block 2; 578 n. 60 Μακεδόνου τόπος

“Place of Macedonus.”

2. *Cuneus* 2, row 13, seat block 2; 581 n. 79 Μ(άρκου) Γ(ρανίου?) Ο(- - -)

3. *Cuneus* 3, row 11, seat block 2; 581 and n. 77 Χεν(τίου?)

4. *Cuneus* 4, row 14, seat blocks 1- 3, near lip; 581 and n. 79, 80

a) Τ(ίτος) Φλαύ(ιος) ; ‘Ρου(- - -)

b) Σεπτίμιος ‘Αρμοδής ; Σεπτίμιος Φιλούμενος ; Σεπτίμιος Χάρμος ; Σεπτίμιος ‘Αρμοδ[ίς?]

c) Αὐφ(ίδιος) Κυ(- - -)

The above texts represent 3 sets of occupants, listed here in chronological order.

5. *Cuneus* 4, row 15, seat blocks 1-3?; 581 and n. 82 Νικ(- - -)

6. *Cuneus* 4, row 15, seat block 1; 581 and n. 81 ‘Ρου(- - -)

Thrace

9. Plovdiv (*Philippopolis* or *Trimontium*). Stadium / amphitheatre? / circus seat. The suggested date of the construction of the venue, which has yet to be securely identified, is the beginning of 3rd c. C.E. Four rows of seats were found with inscriptions but this is the only one published. Tsontchev 1947, 15; Mihailov 1961, no. 1035.

ἱερεύς “Priest.”

Dacia

10. *Sarmizegetusa / Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa*). Amphitheatre *bisellia*. The amphitheatre was built in the first half of the 2nd c. C.E. under Trajan (98-117 C.E.) or perhaps Hadrian and was renovated in 157/158 C.E. The catalogue numbers referenced here (i.e. no. 1) are from Alicu and Opreanu 2000.

- | | | | |
|--|---|------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>CIL</i> III 1522 | <i>M</i> (---) <i>O</i> (---) | 2. no. 1 | <i>ADALAP</i> / <i>HFN</i> |
| 3. <i>CIL</i> III 12586; no. 2 | <i>Aug</i> (<i>ustalis</i> ?) | | “ <i>Augustalis</i> (?)” |
| 4. <i>CIL</i> III 1526; no. 3 | <i>Aur</i> (---) <i>Muc</i> (---) | | |
| 5. <i>CIL</i> III 1522; no. 4 | [---] <i>AVIM</i> [---] | | |
| 6. no. 5 | <i>Coloniae</i> | | “...for <i>or</i> of the colony...” |
| 7. no. 6 | <i>C</i> (---) / <i>Ç</i> (---?) <i>O</i> (---?) vel <i>Ço</i> (---?) | | |
| 8. <i>CIL</i> III 7991; no. 7 | <i>Valer</i> (<i>ii</i> ?) | | |
| 9. <i>CIL</i> III 7991; no. 8 | <i>Flamen</i> | | “Priest.” |
| <p>The term used in Dacia for the high priest of the provincial cult appears to be <i>sacerdos</i> (Fishwick 2002, vol. 3.2, 294-295).</p> | | | |
| 10. no. 9 | <i>Dec</i> (<i>urionis</i> ?) <i>C</i> (---) | | “(Place of?) the decurion...(?)” |
| 11. no. 10 | [---?] <i>I</i> [---?] | 12. no. 11 | [---?] <i>LT</i> [---?] |
| 13. <i>CIL</i> III 1523; no. 12 | [---?] <i>NO</i> [---?] vel <i>N</i> (---) <i>O</i> (---) | | |
| 14. no. 13 | <i>I</i> (---) <i>CLE</i> (---?) | | |
| 15. <i>CIL</i> III 1623; no. 14 | <i>S</i> (---?) <i>C</i> (---?) <i>I</i> (---?) / <i>R</i> (---?) <i>V</i> (---?) | | |
| 16. no. 15 | <i>T</i> (---?) <i>F</i> (---?) <i>II</i> <i>OC</i> (---?) vel <i>OC</i> (---?) | | |

The term used in Dacia for the high priest of the provincial cult appears to have been *sacerdos* (Fishwick 2002, vol. 3.2, 294-295).

11. *Sarmizegetusa / Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa*. Amphitheatre, location of seats unknown; see above no. 10.

1. In three fragments; no. 16 *Locus* “Place of...”
2. no. 17 *Aug(ustalis?) L(---)? I(---?) vel Aug[usta]li[s]? “Augustalis?”*
3. In two fragments; no. 18 [---?] *ABR*[---?] *B*(---) *R*(---) vel *B*(---) *P*(---)
4. In two fragments; no. 19 *Suo fecit V*[---] “Made for *or* with his/her own...”

Sicily

12. Syracuse. Amphitheatre, the crowning of the balustrade of the podium. The amphitheatre was built at the beginning of the Imperial period; the inscriptions date to the 3rd c. C.E. *EAOR III* 85.1-24; *CIL X* 7130.1-22. No. 1 below corresponds to *EAOR III* 85.1 and *CIL X* 7130.1; the other entries follow suit accordingly except for nos. 23 and 24 that do not have a *CIL* reference.

1. [---] *ni eq(uitis) R(omani); lo[cus]---* “...Roman equestrian”; “Place of...”
2. *locus P(ubli?) Lae*[---] “Place of Publius...”

It is possible that nos. 1 and 2 were in fact one text: *Locus P(ubli?) Lae*[---] *ni eq(uitis) R(omani)* “Place of Publius Lae...nus, Roman equestrian” (Buonocore 1992, 120).

3. [---] *RV*+ [---] This could be part of a genitive plural ending, - *orum*.
4. [---] *loc*] *us Alli*[---] “Place of Alli...” 5. *locu*] *s* [---] “Place of...”
6. [---] *Rosciani Antiochi*
7. [---] *x tabularis* The X could pertain to the number of seats (ten) within a specific area assigned to the *tabularii*; alternatively, the inscription could read [*locus illius e*] *x tabularis* (Buonocore 1992, 120).
8. *locus Statili* [---?] “Place of Statilius...” 9. [---] *ssi Eu*[---]
10. [---] *ρησίου* Note the use of the Greek here.

11. [---]RN[---]OSMA+A[---] 12. [---]De]xippi Alfiani V[---]
 13. loc[us] Aur[eli ---] “Place of Aurelius...”
 14. [---]Ru]fini fili ; loc(us) [---] “...son of Rufinius”; “Place of...”
 15. [---]P]onti Q(uiti?)fili) Ro[---] “...Pontus, son of Quintus...”
 16. [---]Sabini ; loc[us ---] “...Sabinus...”; “Place of...”
 17. [---]aeorum 18. [---]Alfiani et Pilati
 19. [---]Telesphoriani Yacin[thi? ---]
 20. [---]Cestiani Faretri ; locus [---] “...Cestianus Faretrus”; “Place of...”
 21. [---]toris 22. [---]Hilario[nis ---] 23. [---]icis et Sterc[---]
 24. [---]O

Sardinia

13. Cagliari (*Carales* / *Caralis*). Amphitheatre seats. The early amphitheatre was Republican, but the major structure was built in the 2nd c. C.E. *CIL* X 7608-10.

1. Cn(aei?) P(---?) F(---?) / V(ibri?) F(---) 2. COS(---?)
 3. E(---) C(---) N(---) vel [---]ECM[---]

Italy

14. Aquileia. Amphitheatre seat. The amphitheatre was built in the mid 1st c. C.E. *EAOR II* 74; *CIL* V 1023.

[?] Iuli S[---]

15. Aquileia. Theatre. The theatre was built in the mid 1st c. C.E.

1. *Bisellium*. Pais 1884 fasc. I, 145.

L(ucii?) M(- - -) / Orig(- - -) loc(a?) II Qu(inti?) et / IIII

2. Seats. Pais 1884 fasc. I, 205; Bandelli 1987.

Seat 1: *[XXII] / [- - -]a / [- - -?]*

Seat 2: *XXI / P(ubli?) Por(- - -) / C(ai?) Val(- - -)*

Seat 3: *Palant(ina?) / Rutediae / A[-]F[-]NAE Procla[-] / [- - -]dua Pret[- - -] ;
XX / C(ai?) Clu(- - -) / C(ai?) Pom(- - -)*

Seat 4: *XIX / T(iti?) V[- - -] / C(ai?) A[- - -] / Comini*

3. Seats. Pais 1884 fasc. I, 206; Bandelli 1987.

Seat 1: *[- - -]T / - - - - - ?*

Seat 2: *MAXSVMA / CEVONIA / A(uli?) Manil(ii?) / EBVR(- - -?) MAXS [?]II*

Seat 3: *VET I / vacat / CVICON / A(uli?) Manil(ii?)*

4. Seats. Pais 1884 fasc. I, 207; Bandelli 1987.

Seat 1: *T(iti?) Cotta / [- - -]N*

Seat 2: *C(ai?) Vari / M(anii) Alleni / Capiton(- - -) / [-]VI*

Seat 3: *O[- - -] vel C[- - -] / - - - - - ? / O[- - -]*

5. Seat. Bandelli 1987, 113 fig. 1.

Seat 1: *R ; [- - -?]R / [- - -?]TA*

Seat 2: *IAE ; VII / M(- - -) Tet(- - -) / L(- - -) Luc(- - -)*

Seat 3: *VI / T(- - -) Tit(- - -) / C(ai?) Cast(- - -)*

16. Rimini (Ariminum). Amphitheatre seats. The amphitheatre was constructed under Hadrian. *EAOR II* 76a-c; *CIL XI* 432a,b,d.

1. *XIII*

2. [- - - *d(ecreto)*] *d(ecurionum)* *l(oca)* [*d]es(ignata?)* [- - -]

“...places assigned by a decree of the decurions...” This combination of two fragments was suggested by Hübner (*ad loc. CIL XI* 432).

3. No *CIL* reference. *Q(uinti)* *C(- - -)* *L(- - -)*

17. Cassino (Casinum). The theatre dates to the late 1st c. B.C.E. *CIL X* 5262.

Mariae Salviae

This inscription, perhaps on a seat, was found in the theatre and now is in the theatre wall.

18. Corfinium. Amphitheatre or theatre seat. First half of 1st c. C.E. *EAOR III* 86.

XXXIII

[*loc(us)*] *C(ai)* *Vetti* *T(iti)* *f(ili)* *Ruf(f)i*

“(Place of) Gaius Vettius Rufus, the son of Titus”

XX[XV]

loc(us) [- - -]

“Place of...”

19. Ivrea (Eporedia). Theatre seat. The theatre dates to 1st c. C.E. *CIL V* 6799.

[- - -?] *EVIIIHV* [- - -] *MV* *ASE* / [- - -?] *AI* *VIII* *V* [- - -] *II* *VIII* [-] *M* / [- - -?] *MINI*

[- - -] *IRI* [-] *D* [- - -?]

20. Puteoli. *CIL X* 2346.

Locus Ollar(- - -) IP? / A(uli?) Cossini Moschae

“Place of Ollar...Aulus Cossinus Moscha.” The original location of this text is not indicated and while it is tempting to see it as reserving a seat in a spectacular venue, perhaps

the amphitheatre of the city, it may also be an honorary or sepulchral inscription.

21. Verona (*Colonia Verona Augusta*). Amphitheatre seat. The amphitheatre is Julio-Claudian. *EAOR II* 72; *CIL V* 3456.

I [cun(eus)?] / loc(us) IIII / lin(ea) I

The numeral *I* from the first line can be taken as referring to the *cuneus* number. This particular seat would have been found in the first *cuneus*, fourth *locus* (although whether this is meant to be a row, normally indicated by *gradus*, is unclear; perhaps instead it can be taken as a section of the *cavea*), and the first *linea*. Here *linea*, usually used to indicate the lines inscribed in the row to separate the seats, appears to be used to identify the seat itself.

22. Volterra (*Volaterrae*). Theatre seats. Construction of the theatre began under Augustus and was completed under Claudius (41-54 C.E.); renovations were carried out in the 2nd c. C.E. *AE* 1957, 221.

1. Fiumi 1955, 136 fig. 21, 143 no. 2.

XXI; Persia

The number 21 identifies the seat and is inscribed on the upper margin. This text most likely reserves a seat for a member, or members, of the *gens Persia*.

2. Fiumi 1955, 137 fig. 22, 144 no.3.

IV; Vib(ius? vel enna?) Gall(onius?)

The number 4 identifies the seat and is inscribed on the upper margin. This inscription could be reserving the seat for an individual, perhaps named *Vibius Gallonius*, or alternatively for a member of the *gens Vibenna*.

Istria

23. Pula (Colonia Iulia Pola). Amphitheatre seats. The original construction of the amphitheatre occurred during the Augustan period; the second phase was Flavian. The inscriptions most likely date to a late phase of the venue. *EAOR* V 75; *CIL* V 86; *II* X 145; listed here in the same order.

1. *L(uci?) A(---) [---]* 2. a) *P(ubli?) A(---) [---]* b) *M(arci?) P(---) C(---)*

3. *[-] Q(---) A(---) / T(iti?) G(---) [---]* 4. *Q(uinti?) A(---) T(---)*

5. *Q(uinti?) A(---) T(---) / T(iti?) G(---) T(---)* 6. *Q(uinti?) At(---) C(---)*

7. *Bello[---]* 8. *C(ai?) C(---) [---]* 9. *C(ai?) Cal(---) [---]*

10. *C(ai?) C(---) I(---)* 11. *C(ai?) C(---) L(---)*

12. *C(---) A(---)* 13. *L(uci?) C(---) X(---)*

14. a) *C(---) P(---)* b) *[-] H(---) C(---)*

15. *C(---) V(---)* 16. *C(ai?) Cos(---) L(---)*

17. *[-] F(---) S(---)* 18. *L(uci?) F(---) S(---) / C(ai?) S(---) P(---)*

19. *T(iti?) G(---) [---]* 20. *T(---) G(---) / H(---) R(---) / V(---) I(---)*

21. *M(arci?) H(---) M(---) / Q(uinti?) [---]*

22. a) *T(iti?) H(---) O(---)* b) *T(iti?) M(---) Y(---)*

23. *[-] I(---) C(---)* 24. *C(ai?) I(---) C(---)*

25. *L(uci?) I(---) [---]* 26. *Q(uinti?) I(---) C(---) / L(uci?) N(---)*

27. *S(exti?) I(---) C(---)* 28. *[---] S(---) / [-?] T(---) I(---) / P(ubli?) A(---) R(---)*

29. a) *C(ai?) L(---) Ave(---)* b) *L(uci?) V(---) C(---) / L(uci?) Vb(---) [---]*

30. *[---] L(---) / L(uci?) I(---) V(---) / C(ai?) C(---) I(---)*

31. *C(ai?) L(---) [---]* 32. *C(ai?) L(---) E(---) / C(ai?) C(---) A(---)*
33. *C(ai?) L(---) Mar(---)* 34. *C(ai?) L(---) Thesmi / C(ai?) S(---) [---]*
- 35.a) *M(arci?) L(---) T(---)* b) *[-?] M(---) N(---)*
36. *S(exti?) L(---) M(---) / P(ubli?) V(---) A(---)* 37. *M(arci?) M(---) [---]*
38. *S(exti?) P(---) M(---) / C(ai) [---]* 39. *P(ubli?) Mar(---) P(---)*
40. *[- - -] T(---) / C(ai?) M(---) [---]* 41. *L(uci?) Q(---) [---] vel*
42. *+ R(---) +* 43. *M(arci?) R(---) M(---)* 44. *C(ai?) S(---) A(---)*
45. *C(ai?) S(---) C(---)* 46. *C(ai?) S(---) Ph(---)* 47. *L(uci?) S(---) [---]*
48. *+ S(---) B(---) / C(ai) I(---) [---]* 49. *P(ubli?) S(---) [---]*
50. *Q(uinti?) S(---) [---]* 51. *Q(uinti?) Sirt(i) Ter(---) / P(ubli?) [---]*
52. *L(uci?) T(---) A(---)* 53. *T(iti?) Q(---) / T(iti?) G(---) Al(---)*
54. *C(ai?) V(---) [---]* 55. *C(ai?) V(---) M(---)* 56. *L(uci?) V(---) M(---)*
- 57.a) *T(iti?) [---]* b) *+ V(---) M(---)* 58. *L(uci?) V(---) +*
59. *C(ai?) Vb(---) A(---)* 60. *[- - -]ens(is?) / L(uci?) Sei B(---)g(---)*
61. *[-?] H(---) P(---)* 62. *[- - -]inor(um?)*
- 63.a) *L(uci?) E(---) [---]* b) *C(ai?) S(---) C(---) vel [-] C(ai?) Sc(---)*
64. *[-] N(---) E(---) / C(ai?) F(---) I(---)* 65. *[-?] O(---) S(---) ++*
66. *[-?] R(---) I(---)* 67. *[-?] Sil(i?) P(---)* 68. *[-?] S(---) S(---)*
69. *[-?] O(---) S(---) / L(uci?) C(---) P(---)* 70. *[-?] S(---) T(---)*
71. *V(---) C(---) / C(---) I(---)*

72.a) $L(uci?) C(---) F(---) / L(uci?) V(---) N(---) / Q(uinti?) At(---) C(---) / L(uci?) L(---) P(---)$

b) $Max(---) / Iun(---) / L(uci?) Vb(---) C(---)$

73. $[- - -?] Ve(---) B(---) / P(ubli?) C(---) [- - -]$

74. *VIII*

75. $[- - -?] D(---) / A(uli?) F(---) S(---) / A(uli?) F(---) [- - -?]$

76. $[- - -] X(---) / C(ai?) V(---) [- - -]$

77. $C(ai?) + [- - -]$

78. $L(uci?) V(---) [- - -]$

79. $P(---) N(---) / Cl(---) As(---)$

80. $Ve(---) No(---) / L(uci?) I(---) H(---) / Q(uinti?) Ri(---) F(---)$

81. $[- - -] / M(arci?) C(---) P(---) / M(arci?) [- - -]$

82.a) $[- - -] H(---)$

b) $P(ubli?) Ae(---) R(---)$

83.a) $[-] S(---) P(---) / L(uci?) V(---) R(---) / C(ai) S(---) P(---) / Q(uinti?) P(---) M(---) / C(---) L(---)$

b) $C(ai?) Tre(blani?) Paul(li?)$

24. Pula (*Colonia Iulia Pola*). Small theatre or odeon. The theatre dates to the end of the 1st c. C.E.; the inscriptions may date to the 2nd c. C.E. *II X 147*.

1. $C(ai?) L(---) F(---) ; S(---) S(---) N(---)$

2. $L(ucii?) V(---) O(---) ; L(ucii?) V(---) O(---)$

3. $[- - -] P(---?) S(---)$

25. Pula (*Colonia Iulia Pola*). Large theatre. The theatre dates to the mid 1st c. C.E.; the inscriptions may date to the late 1st or 2nd c. C.E. *II X 148*.

$Sa[-] S(---) P(---?) A(---?) H(---)$

Gallia Narbonensis

26. Arles (*Arelate*). Amphitheatre podium seats. The amphitheatre dates at the latest to the early Flavian period. *EAOR* V 40a 1-6; *CIL* XII 714.1-6; listed in the same order here. Nos. 7-9 all correspond to *EAOR* V 40a6, and nos. 8 and 9 are not found in *CIL*.

1. [- - -]+*ARI*[- - -] *DIFF*(- - -)

It is possible that this inscription could be restored to reserve seats for oil merchants:
[*ole*]*ari*[*orum*] *diff*(*usorum*) (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 59).

2. [- - -] *d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) loca* [- - -] “Places (assigned) by a decree of the decurions.”

3. [- - -] *l(oca?) XXX d(ecurionum) d(ecreto)*; *loc*[*a* - - -]

“30 places assigned by a decree of the decurions...”; “places...” The repetition of *loca* could indicate a new inscription or the *l* of the first *l(oca)* could instead be part of the number of seats which are being reserved, although that would mean 80 seats were being assigned to an unknown group (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 59).

4. [- - -]*chora*[- - -] 5. + + + + *um* 6. [- - -]*IRI+IN II NI*

7. [- - -]*TANAV*[- - -] 8. *XXXI D III* 9. *IIDL V*

27. Arles (*Arelate*). Amphitheatre; see above no. 26. Seats.

1. Located in the first *maenianum* (*ima cavea*), second *cuneus* to the right of the entrance, and the third row in the western half of the venue. *EAOR* V 40b 7; *CIL* XII 714.7.

L(oca) XXV d(ata) “25 places granted (by a decree of the decurions).”

2. Located above the first *praecinctio*, in the western half of the venue. *EAOR* V 40b 8; *CIL* XII 714.8.

[- - -]*FOSTV*[- - -]

3. Located in the first *maenianum* (*ima cavea*), fourth *cuneus* to the right of the entrance, and the fourth row in the western half of the venue. *EAOR* V 40b 9; *CIL* XII 714.9.

Loca dat[a] “Places granted (by a decree of the decurions).”

4. Located over the southern entrance. *EAOR* V 40b 10; *CIL* XII 714.10.

[- - - *loc*] *us d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) pas* [- - -]

“Place (assigned) by a decree of the decurions.”

5. Located in the second *maenianum* (*media cavea*) between the 2nd and 3rd *vomitioria* to the right of the entrance in the western half of the venue. *EAOR* V 40c 11; *CIL* XII 714.11.

[- - -] *horor(um) TI* [- - -] *vel T* (- - -) *I* (- - -)

It has been suggested that this text and the one above should be joined, creating [*Loc*] *us d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) pas[to] / [p]horor(um) t(empli) I(sidis)*, “The place of the priests of Isis (assigned by) a decree of the decurions” (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 61). If this is the case then the singular *locus* is being used to assign seats to a group; cf. **54.1**.

6. Located in the first *maenianum* (*ima cavea*), third *cuneus* to the left of the entrance and the third row in the eastern half of venue. *EAOR* V 40c 12; *CIL* XII 714.12.

[*lo*] *c(a) XX scholast(icorum)* “20 places for the *scholastici* (assigned by a decree of the decurions).”

28. Arles (Arelate). Theatre, in the orchestra. The theatre is Augustan. *CIL* XII 716.

A[ed]i[l]ium per]m[iss]u / Secundu[s]

“Secundus, by the permission of the aediles.” It is possible that this text is granting a seat to a Secundus, but it is usually the responsibility of the decurions to assign seats, as can be seen in no. **27** above. This text may instead refer to a grant of space in another public context. A series of painted inscriptions on the arches of the exterior of the Pompeian amphitheatre that grant individuals a *locus* by permission of the aediles at first glance appear to be related to seating (*CIL* IV 1096, 1096a, 1097, 1097a, 1097b). They should instead be taken as indicating spaces available outside during spectacles granted to vendors by the aediles; their location does not suggest an immediate link with the arrangements in the *cavea* (Kolendo 1981, 303).

29. Orange (*Arausio*). Theatre seats. The theatre is late Augustan. *CIL* XII 1241.

a) *Eq(uites) G(radus) (tres)*

b) *Eq(uites) G(radus) (tres)*

“The equestrians, three rows.” These two inscriptions each grant *tres gradus*, three rows, to the *equites* of the population. These texts could be assigning the first three rows of each of the two *cunei* in which they were found, providing approximately 170 seats (Kolendo 1981, 310). Alternatively, they could reserve the first three rows of the entire theatre, providing the *equites* with approximately 340 seats (Formigé 1914, 47-49).

30. Nîmes (*Nemausus*). Amphitheatre, crowning of the podium wall. The amphitheatre is late Flavian in date. *EAOR* V 41-44, listed in the same order here.

1. *CIL* XII 5096 [- - -] *Lo(cus?) Sp(- - -) E(- - -) Mar(- - -) [- - -]* “The place of...”

2. *CIL* XII 3320 [- - -] *Severinae*

3. *CIL* XII 3316 + *add.* p. 836; cf. no. 4

N(autis) Atri(cae) et Ovidis loca n(umero) XXV d(ata) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
N(emausensium). N(autis) Rhod(ani) et [A]rar(is) XL d(ata) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
N(emausensium)

“Places numbering 25 granted by a decree of the decurions of Nîmes to the shippers upon the the Ardèche and the Ouvèze. 40 places granted by a decree of the decurions of Nîmes to the shippers upon the the Rhône and the Saône.” The sailors for whom these seats are reserved are identified by the river upon which they travel: the Ardèche, the Ouvèze, the Rhône, and the Saône; cf. no. 4.

4. *EAOR* V 44; *CIL* XII 3317; cf. no. 3

[N(autis) Atr(icae)] et O[vidis] loca XXV [d(ata) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) N(emausensium)].
N(autis) R[hod(ani) et Arar(is) XL d(ata) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) N(emausensium)]

31. Nîmes (*Nemausus*). Amphitheatre; see above no. **30**. Seats. *EAOR* V 45a-f, listed in the same order here.

1. First *maenianum*, third III *cuneus* to the right of the entrance, first row; *CIL* XII 3318a

Cuneus ovalis lo[ca - - -]

The adjective *ovalis* is very rare, and comes from *ovo*, to raise a joyful clamour, to rejoice, or to exult (*clamorem quendam laetum tollere, triumphare*). This may have been an area reserved for members of a *claque*.

2. *CIL* XII 3318b; cf. no. 3 [- - -] *COEL*(- - -)

Most likely a portion of an individual's name, either a *gentilicium* such as *Coelius* or a *cognomen* such as *Coelianus* (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 63).

3. First *maenianum*, fourth *cuneus* to the left of the entrance, fourth row; *CIL* XII 3318c; cf. 2

[- - -] *COEL*(- - -)

4. First *praecinctio*, to the left of a *vomitorium* to the south-west

Arelat(ensium) “(Places of) the Arlesians.”

This inscription reveals that individuals from Arles, presumably official delegates, were given a reserved area in the amphitheatre of Nîmes.

5. First *praecinctio*, to the right of a *vomitorium* to the south-west

D I I D I V P nav(iculariorum? Vel tarum?) *D* “...shipowners or sailors...(?)”

6. Found in the northern *vomitorium* leading to the first *praecinctio*

P I I M E V R

32. Nîmes (*Nemausus*). Amphitheatre; see above no. **30**. Fragmentary inscriptions, perhaps seats. *EAOR* V 46; *CIL* XII 3319.

a) *E I S*

b) *E V I I I S*

c) *E++++VII / - - - - - / - - - - -*

Gallia Aquitania**33. Bourges (*Avaricum Biturigum*). CIL XIII 1197.**

*Gaviae Quietae / Aemili Afri Hvir(i) / filiae / [Gav?i] Blaesi / [- - -]? / [- - -] Bit(urigum)
Cub(orum) / [I]ocus*

“The place of Gavia Queta, the daughter of Aemilius Afrius, duumvir, (the wife of) Gavius(?) Blaesus... (granted by a decree of the decurions) of the Bituriges Cubi.” Since the stone is curved it is likely that the text was fixed to the podium wall in the amphitheatre.

34. Saintes (*Mediolanum Santonum*). Amphitheatre seat. The amphitheatre was originally constructed under Tiberius (14-37 C.E.). The inscription should be dated to the Tiberian-Claudian period. CIL XIII 1052; EAOR V 77.

Hic loc(us) lor(ariorum vel icariorum)

“This is the place of the sellers of leather thongs.” *Lorarii* appear to not only have been the makers and sellers of *lora*, leather thongs, but also individuals who spurred gladiators to fight by means of whips (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 121).

35. Saintes (*Mediolanum Santonum*). Amphitheatre, perhaps seats; see above no. 34. Perhaps seat. The date of the inscriptions is unknown. CIL XIII 1053.

a) *LI(- - -?) B(- - -?) O(- - -?)* b) *S(- - -?)*

Gallia Lugdunensis

36. Lyon (*Lugdunum*). Amphitheatre seats. The first phase of construction was in 19 C.E. and the amphitheatre was embellished in the mid 1st; considerable renovations were carried out in the 2nd c. C.E. EAOR V 78.1-9, listed in the same order here.

1. CIL XIII 1667a; cf. no. 2

[- - -?] Arv(erni), Bit(uriges) C(ubi), Bit(uriges) C(ubi), Bit(uriges) C(ubi), [- - -?]

This inscription and no. 2 both reserve seats for the delegates of two of the peoples of the

Tres Galliae, the *Arverni* and the *Bituriges Cubi*.

2. *CIL* XIII 1667b; cf. no. 1

[- - - *Bit(uriges)*] *C(ubi)*, *Bit(uriges) C(ubi)*, *Bi[t(uriges) C(ubi)*, - - -]

3. *CIL* XIII 1667c [- - -] *Tri(casses)*, *Tri(casses)*, [- - -]

The inscriptions reserve seats for the delegates of one of the peoples of the *Tres Galliae*, the *Tricasses*.

4. *CIL* XIII 1667d [- - - *locus?*] *n(umero) I* ; *des(ignata?) loca n(umero) XX* ; [- - -]

“A place numbering 1”; “Places designated numbering 20...”

5. *CIL* XIII 1667f a) [- - -?] *I(- - -?)* ; *S(- - -?)* [- - -?]
b) [- - -] *P(ublii?) I(- - -) M(- - -)* ; *C(aii?) C(- - -) R(- - -)* [- - -]

6. *AE* 2000, 938 *Glanici*

This inscription reserves seats for the representatives of the people of *Glanum* in *Gallia Narbonensis* (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 124).

7. *AE* 2000, 939 [- - -] *pol*[- - -]

The restoration [*Anti*]*pol*[*itani*] is possible, reserving a seat or seats for the delegates from *Antipolis* in *Gallia Narbonensis* (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 124).

8. *AE* 2000, 940 *Loca* [- - -] / *Mace*[*llar(iorum?)*] vel *Maced* *o*[*num*]?

“Places...of the butchers(?)” The restoration of this inscription is controversial. Vismara and Letizia Caldelli (2000, 125) suggest that this text is reserving an area for representatives of the Macedonians invited to Lyon to watch the games, or for *negotiatores* of the Macedonians (cf. *AE* 2000, 940). Audin and Guey (1976, 202), however, suggest that the inscription be expanded to *loca* [*tot*] *ma*[*c*] *e*[*llar(iorum)*] since a *negotiator artis macellariae* is known from Lyon. The presence of local businessmen in the amphitheatre seems more plausible, particularly after the enlargement of the *cavea*, than the presence of an individual or individuals from Macedonia.

9. *AE* 2000, 941 *L*(- - -) + (- - -?) [- - -?]

37. Lyon (*Lugdunum*). Amphitheatre; see above no. **36**. Balustrade of the podium. *EAOR* V 79.1-9, listed in the same order here.

1. *CIL* XIII 1667e; cf. no. 2

[--- lo?]ca la+[---] / [--- Augu?]stal[---] / [--- Aug?]usta[l ---] / [---]+++++[---] / [---?]

One possible restoration of these inscriptions results in seats being reserved on the podium for *Augustales*; cf. no. 2.

2. *CIL* XIII 1667g; cf. no. 1 [---?] Au[gust? ---]

3. *CIL* XIII 1667h [---]VIN[---] / [---?]

Vismara and Letizia Caldelli (2000, 126) record [--- tres pro]vin[ciae Galliae ---] as a possible restoration.

4. *CIL* XIII 1667i; *AE* 2000, 942 C(ai?) Iu[li ---] / [---?]

5. *CIL* XIII 1667k M(---) A(---) [---?] / [---]mi Saturnali [---?] / [---?]

6. *CIL* XIII 2044 [--- Vel?]lavor(um) [---]

This text may indicate that seats were reserved on the podium of the amphitheatre for the delegates of the people of *Vellavi*, members of the *Tres Galliae* (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 128).

7. a) [---]+u+[---] b) [---]T[---] c) [---]VO[---]

For fragment a) it is possible to suggest the names of some of the peoples in the *Tres Galliae* such as [--- Ae]duo[r(um) ---], [--- Viroman]duo[r(um) ---], or [--- Vi]duc[as(sium) ---] (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 128).

8. *AE* 2000, 943 [---?] L(ocus?) Anemi “The place of Anemus.”

9. *AE* 2000, 944 [---]nus [---?] vel [---]nus[---]

This could be read as the end of a name in the nominative (although seats were usually reserved in the genitive). Vismara and Letizia Caldelli (2000, 129) suggest perhaps the

names of the individuals who completed the work on the amphitheatre: *Adrianus* or *Vespasianus*.

Gallia Belgica

38. Paris (*Lutetia Parisiorum*). Amphitheatre seats. The amphitheatre is Trajanic in date. The inscriptions should be dated to the 3rd or 4th c. C.E. *EAOR* V 80.1-51; *CIL* XIII 3035.3-53, listed in the same order here unless otherwise specified.

1. a) +++ b) *Q(uinti) Marti ; SX*

The two inscriptions on this block are superimposed, although which is the earlier is unclear.

2. [- - -]+++*MEṬIAI* 3. [- - -]*TE IR*[- - -]

4. a) *Martia*[-] b) [- - -]*rtii* These two inscriptions are superimposed.

5. [- - -]*BEN*[- - -]

6. a) *SS* b) *Livi*[- - -] These two inscriptions are superimposed.

7. a) *M+++++++* b) *Cas*(- - -) *Vat*(- - -) *B*[- - -]

These two inscriptions are superimposed.

8. *CIL* XIII 3035.10 +*E+ER*[- - -] 9. *CIL* XIII 3035.12a +*I+LAVSI*

10. *CIL* XIII 3035.13 [- - -]*II GLC* 11. *M*(- - -) *N*(- - -) *P*(- - -) *P*(- - -)

12. [- - - ?]*OC*(- - -)

13. a) on the rise: [- - -]*R+E*[- - -] b) [- - -]*MAGN*[- - -]

c) on the seat: *Aus*(- - -)

The two inscriptions on the rise are superimposed; the name on the seat is most likely that of a later occupant.

14. a) [- - -]+IR++A[- - -] b) [- - -]+VEN++[- - -]

These two inscriptions are superimposed.

15. ~~NAV~~+++ Vismara and Letizia Caldelli (2000, 135) suggest a restoration of *navutae* but others, such as perhaps *navicularii*, are also possible.

16. [- - -]NOS[- - -]

17. On the rise On the seat
a) [- - -]EGI+[- - -] b) *Dac*(- - -)

18. a) [- - -]AY+I[- - -] b) [- - -]+P RA+[- - -] These two inscriptions are superimposed.

19. [- - - P]ostumi L[- - -] 20. [- - -]+vi *Tetrici*

21. [- - -]O Crati 22. a) [- - -]us[- - -] b) [- - -]V[- - -]

23. a) [- - -]OT[- - -] b) [- - -]IE These two inscriptions are superimposed.

24. [- - -]R+[- - -] 25. a) on the rise: [- - -]+ON+G[- - -]
b) on the seat: [- - -] It(- - -) ; Ri(- - -) [- - -]

26. *CIL* XIII 3035.11 and 29 a) [- - -]+X+I+ME[- - -] These texts are superimposed.
b) [- - -]AS[- - -]

27. St(- - -) L(- - -) 28. a) [- - -]R[- - -] b) [- - -]CII[- - -]

29. TC+M+V+ 30. +AL+A+A+IAV SX

31. a) [- - -]A[- - -] b) [- - -]ATI+[- - -] c) M(- - -)

32. [- - -]AVVMS[- - -]

33. a) +APR(- - -?) QRFI+++ b) L(- - -?) APR(- - -?) TV+I

These inscriptions are superimposed.

34. a) [- - -]AVIIC MA+++[- - -] b) [- - -]VLIC KAL[- - -]

35. [---]VOE[---]

36. a) on the rise: [---]VO+I[---] b) on the seat: M(---)

37. [---]M]arcellus 38. [---]refi(---) Caeri(---) Gall(---) [---]

39. [---]RO+[---]

40. a) [---]X[---] b) [---]R++IEMA[---] c) [---]IA[---]

41. *CIL* XIII 3035.44 a) [---]FER b) [---]MA[---]

The two inscriptions do not appear to be related since they have varying letter heights and were inscribed at different depths.

42. *CIL* XIII 3035.44 a) IV(---?) b) *SSILAM*

These two two inscriptions are superimposed.

43. [---]SA 44. a) *Quint+* b) +++++

45. a) [---]RI[---] b) [---]+AR[---] These two inscriptions are superimposed.

46. a) [---]RA[---] b) [---]FEBV[---] 47. [---]EVEV++RI[---]

48. a) [---]XT++[---] b) [---]+RI[---]

These two inscriptions do not appear to be related.

49. *PIMRIS* 50. [---]BT[---]

51. [---]R[---] The *R* is inscribed underneath a monogram in which an *I* and perhaps a *K* can be distinguished (Vismara and Letizia Caldelli 2000, 146).

53. This block may not be from the podium. *EAOR* V 80.53; *AE* 2000, 973a.

M(---)A(---)H(---)

39. Paris (*Lutetia Parisiorum*). Amphitheatre; see above no. **38**.. Blocks of the podium cornice.

1. *EAOR* V 80.52; *CIL* XIII 3035a [- - -]C+ECVPAVI+[- - -]
2. *EAOR* V 80.54; *AE* 2000, 973b [- - -]mus
3. *EAOR* V 80.55; *AE* 2000, 973c [- - -]+I+A++RO++N+[- - -]
4. *EAOR* V 80.56; *AE* 2000, 973d [- - -]R[- - -]

40. Pachten (*Contiomagus*). Theatre seats. The theatre, located within a sanctuary to the Celtic river goddess Pritona (known also as Ritona and Ritonía), may date to the 2nd c. C.E. Schillinger-Häfele 1977, 467-72, no. 27.1-33; the inscriptions are listed in the same order here.

1. *lo(cus) Privati(i) Biraci* "The place of Privatus, son of Biracus."
2. *Serani(i) Solli(i)*
3. *Tes[s] i(linii vel i?) Martalu(s)*
4. *Victori(i?) / Art(onii vel tonis)*
5. *[Ma?]n[i?]li(i)? Matuaci*
6. *Moxius*
7. *Seișseri(i) [V]olli[i vel ionii?]*
8. *Litugeni(i) [- - -]*
9. *Mascelio Col[- - -]iu(s) Decenti(us)*
10. *[M]ascli*
11. *T(iti?) Terti[i - - -?]*
12. *Cotti*
13. *Simil[- - -]*
14. *Seno[- - -]*
15. *P(ubli?) Con[- - -]*
16. *Senomaini At(ti)l(i)i(i)?*
17. *Q(uinti?) Car(ii?) Donisil(i)i?*
18. *[- - -]ari(i?) Atti(i?)*
19. *Petrulli*
20. *[- - -]SSIN[- - -]*
21. *Cobnerti*
22. *[- - -]amo Atteḡ*
23. *Man(- - -) Iassi*
24. *Mako*
25. *[- - -]iss(- - -?) Petr[ulli?]*
26. *[- - -] Satto[- - -]*
27. *Cintu(s)mu(s?) Primitivi*
28. *Faustu(s?)*
29. *C(ai?) Victo[- - -]*
30. *Sexti(i) V(i)cani*
- 31.a) *M(- - -?) D(- - -?) Moce(tii?)*
- b) *Moceti(i)*
- c) *Axsilli(i)*

32. *Primani*33. *Vicanus*

41. Trier – Altbachtal. Theatre seats. The theatre, located within a sanctuary to Hecate and two unknown goddesses, dates to approximately 100 C.E. From what direction the seat blocks are numbered is unknown. Gose 1972, 104-107.

Northern end of *cavea*

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Row 1, seat block 2 | [T?]ott(---) Vi(---) | | |
| 2. Row 1, seat block 3 | a) PIM(---?) vel [---?]PIM[---?] | | |
| | b) l(ocus?) Iaes[---?] | “Place of Iaes...” | |
| 3. Row 3, seat block 1 | [---?]TA[---?] vel T(---?) A(---?) | | |
| 4. Row 3, seat block 5 | <i>Sex(ti) Caup(ii?) Sec(---)</i> | | |
| 5. Row 4, seat block 1 | <i>L(ucii?) Teu(---)</i> | | |
| 6. Row 4, seat block 2 | [---?]T[---?] | | |
| 7. Row 5, seat block 1 | [---?]N Q[---?] vel N(---?) Q(---?) | | |
| 8. Row 5, seat block 2 | [---?]V[---?] vel V(---?) | | |
| 9. Row 6, seat block 1 | <i>L(---) T(---) vel L(---) E(---)</i> | | |
| 10. Row 6, seat block 3 | [---?]R[---?] | | |
| 11. Row 6, seat block 4 | <i>l(ocus?) Çovi(---)</i> | “Place of Covi...” | |
| 12. Row 7, seat block 1 | <i>Sev(---)</i> | 13. Row 7, seat block 4 | [---?]IL[---?] |
| 14. Row 8, seat block 1 | <i>Mar(---)</i> | 15. Row 8, seat block 2 | [---?]ÇI[---?] |
| 16. Row 11, seat block 9 | [---]I | | |
| 17. Row 12, seat block 9 | [---?]VSL[---?] vel [---?]SAL[---?] | | |

18. Row 13, seat block 4 *M*(---) *C*(---) *C*(---) *A*(---)
19. Row 13, seat block 5 *l*(ocus?) *Iai*[---?] “Place of *Iai*...”
20. Row 13, seat block 8 [---?]*D*[---?] vel *D*(---)
21. Row 13, seat block 9 [---?]*L*[---?] vel *L*(---)
22. Row 14, seat block 6 [---?]*ÇI*[---?] vel *Ç*(---) *I*(---)
23. Row 14, seat block 7 [---?]*L*+ [---?] vel *L*(---) +(---)
24. Row 16, seat block 1 [---?]*LI*[---?] vel *L*(---) *I*(---)
25. Row 16, seat block 2 [---]*I*
26. Row 16, seat block 3 [---?]*VIT*[---?]
27. Row 16, seat block 4 *l*(ocus?) *Mui*(---) vel *l*(ocus?) *M*(a?)*vi*

“The place of *Mui*... or The place of *Mavus*.”

28. Row 16, seat block 5 *C*(ai?) *Tot*(---)
29. Row 16, seat block 6 [---?]*LIM*[---?] vel *L*(---) *I*(---) *M*(---)
30. Row 16, seat block 9 [---?]*AT*[---?] vel *A*(---) *T*(---)

Southern end of cavea

31. Row 1, seat block 1 [---?]*BIVSVITAL*[---?]

Although *Vitalis* is a *cognomen* and may be restored here, it is not paralleled in this area (Gose 1972, 105).

32. Row 1, seat block 2
 a) [---?]*ADAR*[---?]
 b) *IACI*(---?) *II LA* *IACHI*(---?)
33. Row 1, seat block 5
 a) *Vitalis* an earlier inscription reads: *QVIR*(---)
 b) [---?]*SAS*[---?] vel *Sas*(---)

34. Row 1, seat block 6 *Tertas*

Tertas is inscribed overtop of *Tertius*, and beneath these two texts is yet another name.

35. Row 1, seat block 8 *Cai(i?)*

36. Row 1, seat block 9 [---] 37. Row 2, seat block 5 [---?] *VDI* [---?]

38. Row 2, seat block 6 [---?] *I* vel *I*(---?) *Claudi*

39. Row 2, seat block 7 a) [---?] *TS* [---?] vel *T*(---) *S*(---)
b) [---?] *IVI* [---?]

40. Row 3, seat block 1 *B*[---] vel *B*(---)

41. Row 3, seat block 3 [---?] *ATILIVII* [---?]

This inscription could perhaps be read as *Atilevii*, *At(t)i Levii*, or *At(t)illi Ve*(---) (Gose, 106).

42. Row 3, seat block 7 a) [---?] *INS* [---?] vel [---?] *IVS* [---?] b) [---]

43. Row 3, seat block 8 a) [---?] *VIIITIMA* *I*[---?] b) [---?] *VIIM* [---?]

a) could be resolved as *Vettimanii* or *Vetti Ma*(---) (Gose, 107).

44. Row 4, seat block 3 [---?] *ÇRAECI* [---?] Perhaps *Graeci* (Gose 106).

45. Row 4, seat block 4 [---] *L* [---]

46. Row 4, seat block 7 [---?] *MII* [---?] vel [---?] *MIL* [---?]

47. Row 5, seat block 3 [---] *E* [---]

48. Row 6, seat block 4 [---?] *S* [---?] vel *S*(---?)

49. Row 6, seat block 5 [---?] *SA* [---?] vel *SA*(---) vel *S*(---) *A*(---)

50. Row 9, seat block 4 [---?] *A* [---?] vel [---?] *I* [---?] vel *A*(---) vel *I*(---)

Ex situ

51. [---?]AL[---?]
52. [---?]MEL[---?] vel *Mel*(---)
53. [---?]MEL[---?] vel *Mel*(---)
54. [---?]M[---?] vel *M*(---)
55. *Ocellionis*

Hispania Baetica

42. Córdoba (*Colonia Patricia Corduba*). Theatre seats. Ventura Villanueva 1999, nos. 8-11, listed in the same order here.

1. Western sector, located in either *media* or *summa cavea*. Date: early 1st c. C.E. *Ludi Romani* 2002, no. 19; *CIL* II²/7 571.

[Anna]eae / [Opta?]*tae* l(ocus) p(edum) II

“A place of 2 feet for *Annaea Optata*(?).”

2. CIL II²/7 466a and b a) *P(ubli) Furi Philotimi* Date: first half of the 1st c. C.E.
 b) *Rullinae fil(iae)* Date: second half of the 1st c. C.E.

“Place of Rullina, daughter of...”

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 3. <i>CIL</i> II ² /7 456 | [- -] <i>Fannia</i> [- -] | Date: end of the 1 st c. C.E. |
| 4. <i>CIL</i> II ² /7 608a | <i>Num</i> (- -) | Date: Julio-Claudian |

43. **Cordoba** (*Colonia Patricia Corduba*). Theatre or amphitheatre seat. Antonine period. *CIL* II²/7 608.

Messiae

44. Hispalis. Corzo Sánchez 1994a, 243; *CIL* II 6283.

[lo]c(us) ordin(is) [decurionum?] / [- - -] et Iuli Ho[norii?] [- - -] / [- - -] i e(gregii) v(iri)
curato[r]is [- - -] [- - - ?] / [l]oca v[e]t(er)anoru[m] [- - - ?]

“The place of the decurional order...and Iulius Honorius(?)...*vir egregius, curator*...places of the *veterani*(?)...” This inscription must be expanded with caution since the entire left and right sides are missing. The double *II* in *VIIRANORV* in the inscription as it is presented in *CIL* may have originally been an E and a T. In Valentia both *veteres* and *veterani* are mentioned in inscriptions, evidence for a type of double community (Galsterer 1971, 53). These *veterani* of Hispalis, if this text is restored correctly, would appear to be the new settlers of Hispalis rather than merely a military contingent of the local population. The designation *egregius vir* is an indication of equestrian status.

45. Italica. Amphitheatre seats. The amphitheatre was constructed between Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius (117-180 C.E.), after Italica's promotion to *colonia*. Corzo Sánchez 1994b, 195-196; *CIL* II 5102-16 (except no. 16 below). Listed in the same order here unless specified otherwise.

1. [- - - A?]mianti / [- - -]ma / [- - -]B[- - - ?] / - - -vir(i?)

2. M(arci) Ax(- - -) [Q(uinti)]filius) / [- - -] Mar[celli?]

“Place of Marcus Ax...son of Quintus...Marcellus(?)”

3. T(- - -) A(- - -) A(- - -)

4. G(- - -) C(- - -) / M(- - -) / L(- - -) / E(- - -)

5. a) Earlier inscription
L(- - -) M(- - -)

b) Later inscription
Q(uinti?) L(- - -) S(- - -) / Iul(ii) Pr(im)i?)

6. Q(- - -) / P(- - -) Mo(- - -)

7. [Po]tamii Osm? Natalis ; S(- - -) F(- - -) M(- - -) pr(- - - ?) ; Ha(- - -) L(- - -) S(- - -) Pi(- - -) ;
[- - -]mae ; [- - -]Pot]ami[i]i?

There are several inscriptions on this fragment, some of which are superimposed; it is difficult to determine which inscriptions are related.

8. T(erentii) La[e]t(i)?

9. [- - - Val?]eriani ; S[- - -] These two texts do not appear to be related.

10. M(arci?) Val(eri?) Cas[t]o(ris) / [et] iunioru(m)?

“Place of Marcus Valerius Castor and of the younger men(?)”

11. Q(uinti) V(ibi vel ibii) / L(- - -?) A(- - -?)

12. [- - -]ies / C(- - -)

13. [- - -]oris / [- - -]a[l]is?

14. [- - -]a Us[- - -] / C(- - -)

These texts do not appear to be related.

15. M(- - -) / G(- - -)

16. CIL 2.2, no. 522; CIL II 5372 M(- - -) [- - -?] / Fabior(um) Se[- - -] [- - -?]

Hispania Tarraconensis

46. Tarragona (Tarraco). Theatre seats. The theatre appears to have been Augustan. *El Teatro Romano. La Puesta en Escena* 2003, 166-67.

1. [- - -]Aur(elii?) In(- - -?)

2. T(itii?) Q(- - -)

3. Vet(- - -) P(- - -)

4. Vav(- - -) Bal(- - -)

47. Tarragona (Tarraco). Seats from an amphitheatre, theatre, or perhaps administrative building. 1st- 2nd c. C.E. CIL II 4280a-c; Alföldy 1975, no. 250 a, b, 251.

1. Ex H(ispania) c(iteriore) Vet(tones) Met(ercosani)

“The Vettones Metercosani of Hispania Citerior.” This inscription assigns seats to envoys from the *concilium provinciae* of *Hispania Citerior*. *Metercosa* was a place in the border area of the *Vettones* and the *Carpetani*. The identity of the building in which this text, as well as nos. 2 and 3, was found is unknown, although it has been suggested that it was an administrative building in the complex for the provincial imperial cult (Fishwick 1991, vol. II.1, 580-581; 2004, vol. III.3, 38-40). It is also possible that it was the amphitheatre which is closely connected to this complex; cf. no.2.

2. *Ex H(ispania) c(iteriore) Vet(tones) Met(ercosani)*

3. *C(- - -) X(- - -) M(- - -) / p(edes) XVIII s(emis) L(- - -)* “...18 feet ...semis...”

48. Tarragona (*Tarraco*). Amphitheatre seats. The inscriptions date at the earliest to the Flavian period but a later date is more likely. The majority of these texts appear to be very fragmentary names. Where two references are provided the first is to Alföldy 1975 and the second to Mayer and Massó 1990; where only one is listed it is to Mayer and Massó 1990.

1. no. 240; no.2 *Ark(arii) (vicesimae)*

These individuals are either the *arkarii XX hereditatum* or *libertatis*, those clerks responsible for the inheritance tax or the tax on manumission.

2. no. 433; no.1 *(Sevirorum) / V*

Although Mayer and Massó suggest that this inscription is reserving five seats for the *seviri*, the second line of text is smaller, suggesting that it may be unrelated to the first line.

3. no. 805-806; no. 3 a) *M(arci?) Aeli(- - -)* b) *L(- - -) L(- - -) C(- - -)*

4. no. 807-808; no.8 a) *F(abii?) A(- - -)* b) *[- - -]L Afric(- - -)*

While Alföldy suggests a reading of *L(- - -) Art(- - -)* or *Larc(- - -)* for b), Mayer and Massó restore the inscription instead to have a *nomen* such as *Africanus*, *Africanus*, or *Africius*.

5. no. 809; no.7 *V(- - -) E(- - -) R(- - -) vel Ver(- - -)*

6. no. 810; no. 15 *[- - -]ION [- - -?]*

7. no. 811; no. 22 *L(ucii?) V(- - -) A(- - -) ; I(- - -?)*

8. no. 812-813; no. 25 a) *P(ublii?) C(- - -)* b) *M(- - -) F(- - -)*

9. no. 4 *Q(uinti) Grani Adiuto[ris]*

10. no. 5 *[- - -] Mari Sil[vani vel onis?]*

11. no. 6	a) [---]R	b) <i>Luc</i> (---)	c) <i>Se</i> (---)
12. no. 9	a) [---]GIMVS	b) <i>Anni</i> [u]s	c) SA[---]
13. no. 10	<i>Q(uinti) TH</i> [---]	14. no. 11	[---]O / [-]RRI <i>Feli</i> (cis)
15. no. 12	<i>FA</i> [---]	16. no. 13	[---]NO[---]
17. no. 14	<i>LM</i> [---]	18. no. 16	<i>CHE</i> [---]
19. no. 17	[---]IV[---]	20. no. 18	[---?]IV[---?]
21. no. 19	[---]IV[---]	22. no. 20	-----/[---]IV[---]/-----
23. no. 21	<i>L(ucii?) R</i> (---) ; <i>C(ai?) R</i> (---) ; <i>C(ai?)</i> [---]		
24. no. 23	<i>L(ucii?) C</i> (---) <i>C</i> (---)	25. no. 24	[---] <i>M</i> (---) <i>F</i> (---) [---]
26. no. 26	<i>F</i> (---) <i>A</i> (---)	27. no. 27	[---?]E[---?]
28. no. 28	[---?]M[---?]	29. no. 29	[---]M[---]
30. no. 30	[---]N[---]	31. no. 31	[---?]O[---?]
32. no. 32	[---]O[---]	33. no. 33	[---]L[---]
34. no. 34	[---]XXVI[---]		

If in fact numbers, this text could be indicating how many seats were assigned to a particular group it could be identifying a specific seat.

35. no. 35; cf. no. 34 [---]XX[---]

Hispania Lusitania

49. Mérida (*Augusta Emerita*). Amphitheatre, podium wall. The amphitheatre was dedicated to Augustus in 8 B.C.E. Ramírez Sádaba 1994, nos. 11-15, listed in the same order here.

1. a) *Decurionis* L(- - -) ; [- - -?] *G*(- - -?) b) [- - -] *Vetti* / [- - -]

a) “(Place of) the decurion...” The letter type of the first text in a) differs from that of the second text, suggesting that they are unrelated.

2. *E*[-?] *HE*[- - - ?] *VID*(- - -) *SEV*(- - -) *L*(- - -) *ER*(- - -?) / *Z II* / *T*(- - -) *L*(- - -)

3. [- - -?] *A*(- - -) *L*(- - -) 4. *G*(- - -) *M*(- - -) / *T*(- - -) *O*(- - -) / [- - -]

5. [- - -] / *C*(- - -) *P*(- - -) / *C*(- - -) *I*(- - -) / *T*(- - -) *C*(- - -)

50. Mérida (*Augusta Emerita*). Theatre seats. The initial construction of the theatre began in 16 B.C.E.. Ramón Mélida 1925, 144.

E(*quites*) (*decem*) *d*(*ecreto*) [*d*(*ecurionum*)]

“The equestrians, 10 rows?/seats? by a decree of the decurions.”

Britannia

51. Chester (*Deva Victrix*). Amphitheatre seat. The first phase of amphitheatre construction dates to the fourth quarter of the 1st c. C.E. and it was reconstructed in stone just after 100 C.E.; the inscription dates after the 2nd c. C.E. *EAOR* V 82; Thompson 1976, 86 no. 5, Fig. 22.5.

Serano locus “The place for Seranus.”

Although the editors of *EAOR* have *Serano l`o`cus*, the *o* is clearly visible and on the same line as the rest of the text. Note the use of the dative rather than the genitive.

Germania Superior

52. Ladenberg (*Lopodunum*). Theatre seats. The theatre dates to the 2nd c. C.E. and all the inscriptions date to the mid 2nd c. C.E. unless otherwise noted. Wiegels 2000 nos. 18-26, listed in the same order here.

1. *CIL* XIII 6421e [*vicanis Lopodunensibu*]s *Q(uitus) Cassius* [- - -]

“Quintus Cassius..., to the villagers of Lopodunum.”

2. *CIL* XIII 6421b, c *vic(anis) Lop(odunensibus) Q(uitus) Gabinius Pompeianus*

“Quintus Gabinius Pompeianus, to the villagers of Lopodunum.”

3. *CIL* XIII 6421d *vic(anis) Lop(odunensibus) Martialin(ius) Ma[rtialis?]*

“Martialinius Martialis(?), to the villagers of Lopodunum.”

4. *CIL* XIII 6421a [*vic(anis)*] *Lopodun(ensibus) Q(uitus) Vennonius* [- - -]

“Quintus Vennonius...to the villagers of Lopodunum.”

5. *CIL* XIII 6422a *T(itus vel iti) vacat Fl(avius vel avi) Ian(uarius vel uarii) m(agister vel agistri?) p(agi?)*

“(Place of?) Titus Flavius Ianuarius, the *magister pagi*(?).”

6. *CIL* XIII 6422b *T(itus) I(- - -) V(- - -)* Date: mid 2nd c. to early 3rd c. C.E.

7. *Optati(i) Tetrici*

Wiegels (2000, 67) suggests that the use of the genitive here indicates above all the right to the seat by the individual named. He argues that the inscriptions in the nominative name individuals who donated funds to the theatre and who are therefore being commemorated, and that the right to the seat in these cases is only of secondary importance.

8. *CIL* XIII 6421f [- - -] *Peregrinus*

9. V(- - -?) M(- - -?) S(- - -?) C(- - -?) D(- - -?) S(- - -?) P(- - -?) / et S(- - -) *Lunaris* [- - -?]

Date: late 2nd c. to early 3rd c. C.E.

53. Speyer (*Nemetae* / *Noviomagus*). Nesselhauf 1939, no. 72.

[- - -] *loca n(umero)* [- - - / - - - *d(ata) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*] *c(ivitatis) N(emetum)*

“Places numbering... by a decree of the decurions of *Civitas Nemetum*.”

54. Trier (*Augusta Treverorum*). Amphitheatre seats. The inscriptions should be dated to the mid 3rd c. C.E. (the end of the 1st c., the date by which the amphitheatre was constructed, is less likely). *EAOR* V 81.1-4, listed in the same order here.

1. Ginestet 1991, no. 206; *CIL* XIII 3708

a) *locus* [- - -?] b) *Iuven(um)* [- - -?] “Place of the young men.”

Both inscriptions seem to be from the same text, meaning that they are reserving an area for the local association of *iuvenes*, young men. Here *locus* is used in the singular to reserve seats for a group; cf. **27.5**.

2. *CIL* XIII 11331.1 [- - -] *cioni{i}s* [- - -]

3. *CIL* XIII 11331.4 *lo[cus - - -]* “Place of...”

4. *CIL* XIII 11330
a) lower rise: *locus A*[- - -] “Place of...”
b) upper rise: *VINII*[- - -]

Pannonia Inferior

55. Aquincum. Civilian amphitheatre seats. The amphitheatre was constructed by 162 C.E. Those inscriptions that can be dated fall within the reign of Severus Alexander (222-235 C.E.). *CIL* III 10493a-x, with no j; listed in the same order here.

1. MacMullen 1963, 100-101 *Aur(elii?) Gentilis* / *Va*[- - -]

2. *Aur(elii) D(- - -) Iul(- - -)*3. *Aur(elii) [- - -?] / Sep[- - -]*4. *[- - -?] BOI(- - -?) vil(ici?)*

Kolendo (1979, 47) suggests that this individual could be the *vilicus* of the *statio vectigalis*, the overseer of the post in charge of taxation.

5. MacMullen 1963, 101

Bonat(i) S(- - -)

6. MacMullen 1963, 101

Cla(udii?) Fab(- - -)

MacMullen suggests that *Fab(- - -)* may instead be *Fau(sti)*, and that the individual in question may be Claudius Pompeius Faustus (*CIL* III 3438, 10475).

7. *Iul(ii?) [Fe]licis*

8. MacMullen 1963, 101

*Val(erii?) Iuliani et Ael(ii?) Quinti*9. *C(aii?) Val(erii?) Servinonim(?)*

10. MacMullen 1963, 101; Kolendo 1979, 47, 52 n. 89

Locus Val(erii?) / kar(cerarii) leg(ionis)

“Place of Valerius, the warden of the legionary jail.” MacMullen suggests that *VAL* could be expanded to *val(etudinarium)*, the military hospital within the camp, but *Val(erius)* or another name seems more likely.

11. *VETR I[- - -?]*

12. MacMullen 1963, 101-102

Flo(- - -)

MacMullen proposes Marcus Aurelius Florentinus (*CIL* III 3535) or Aurelius Florianus (*CIL* III 3474) as candidates for the occupancy of this seat.

13. *Prisc[i?]*

14. MacMullen 1963, 102

[- - -?] Severini / [- - -?] Vet(erani? vel tii?)

MacMullen suggests that the occupant of this seat was a Marcus Aurelius Severinus (*CIL* III 3617).

15. [---] C(---) I(---) 16. [---] G III 17. [---] IL[---]

18. [---] NO[---]

19. MacMullen 1963, 102 [Se?]pt(imii?) V[e]r(ani?) R(---?)

Septimius Veranus was a veteran of the second legion of 218 C.E. (Macmullen, 102; *CIL* III 3344).

20. T(---) C(---) G(---) 21. T(---) C(---) G(---)

22. [---?] T(---) Max(---) 23. VE(---?) S(---?) ET III

Pannonia Superior

56. Carnuntum. Military amphitheatre seat. The military amphitheatre dates to the mid 2nd c. C.E. *CIL* III 11253; Kolendo 1979, 49.

(*Quattuorviri*) vel (*Quattuorvirorum*)

This inscription, reserving seats for the magistrates of the civilian settlement, was found on a seat in the smaller, northern *tribunal*.

57. Carnuntum. Civilian amphitheatre. The amphitheatre was constructed between 124 C.E. and the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180 C.E.). *AE* 1934, 263, 264; Miltner 1933, 36; Kolendo 1979, 49-50.

1. *Loca / Augustal / ium m(unicipi) A(elii) K(arnuntini)*

“The places of the *Augustales* of the *municipium* of Carnuntum.” The entranceway above which this inscription was found leads to seats in the second *maenianum*.

2. *Loca / pagi / Aeleni*

“Places of the *pagus Aelenus*.” The entranceway above which this inscription was found leads to seats in the first *maenianum*. The *pagus Aelenus* was a subdivision of the territory of Carnuntum.

3. MacMullen 1963, 100

T(iti?) filii?) Nigri “...Niger, son of Titus(?)”**Africa Proconsularis**

58. Carthage. Amphitheatre, most likely seating inscriptions. The first phase of amphitheatre construction was Augustan or Julio-Claudian and a considerable extension was carried out in the 2nd and 3rd c. C.E. The inscriptions date at the earliest to the time of Constantine (306-337 C.E.) and perhaps as late as the fifth century (Kolendo 1981, 313; Bomgardner 2000, 98). *CIL VIII* 24659 1-43, listed here in the same order. If a corresponding reference to Delattre (1898) exists, it is provided in brackets.

1. [- - - *B?*] *oncari vic(- - -) Fo[- - - / - - -] inius ex vic(ario) Af(ricae)?*

In the 3rd c. C.E. *vicarii* were equestrian procurators of provinces appointed by the emperor to replace senatorial governors. When Diocletian reorganized the empire into dioceses each diocese was entrusted to a *vicarius*, the official agent of the praetorian prefects.

- 2.(5) a) [- - -] / [- - -] *v(iri) c(larissimi)*
 b) *Gabinian(i) / Firmi v(iri) [c(larissimi)?]*

Vir clarissimus and *clarissimus vir* (“most illustrious” or “most honourable man”) are senatorial designations; those individuals thus identified were members of the senatorial order. Cf. nos. 4, 5b, 6, 7, 8a, 9, 10, 11, 18b, no. 59.3.

3. *Gabinian[i] / +T Theod[- - -]*

- 4.(2) [- - -] *ienti Pacati v(iri) [c(larissimi)?]*

- 5.(6) a) *Pomp(eii?) Innocen / ti(s?) Iunior(is) c(larissimi?) p(ueri?)*

Clarissimus puer and *puer clarissimus* (“most illustrious” or “most honourable boy”) are senatorial designations; those individuals thus identified were of senatorial families. Cf no. 13.

- b) [- - -?] *OC(- - -?) F[-?]vinii c(larissimi) v(iri) P(- - -?) V(- - -?)*

- 6.(3) a) [---]aec[hi? vel ili?] v(iri) c(larissimi)
 b) *Restituti* c(larissimi) v(iri) / V[---]
- 7.(4) *Valeriani* v(iri) c(larissimi)
- 8.(1) a) [---]ebli *Iun(ioris?)* c(larissimi) v(iri)
 b) *p(rincipalis) a(lmae) [K(arthaginis)]* vel *Pa[---]* vel *P(ublii?) A(---)*

T. Kotula (1979, esp. 243) dates the title of *principalis almae Karthaginis*, assigned to leading dignitaries of the city, to the fourth century C.E.; cf. nos. 16, 18a, 21a, no. 59.1.

9. [---]tii c(larissimi) v(iri) / [---]itiani c(larissimi) v(iri)
- 10.(7) a) [---]vi v(iri) c(larissimi) / [---] *P(ublii?)* b) [---?]B(---?)
- 11.(26) [---]i v(iri) c(larissimi) / [---]SIC(---?)
- 12.(9) a) *S(---) P(---) C(---)* b) *Pom(---)*
13. [---?]LIVIC[---?] / [---]si *p(ueri?)* c(larissimi?) *E(---) T(---)*
- 14.(16)a) [---]i v(iri) *d(evoti) ag(entis) in r(e)b(us)?*

The *agentes in rebus* were brought in by Diocletian to replace the *frumentarii* and served as couriers between the central government and the provinces; they came to be known as agents of the secret police.

- b) *Sex(ti?)* [---?] c) *Cogn(---)*
- 15.(14) [---]usis *Pa[---]* / [sace]rdota[lis?] “...high priest...”
- 16.(12) [Mine?]rvi *Flaviani (duoviri)* / [---?] *T(---) p(rincipalis) a(lmae) K(arthaginis)*
- 17.(10) [Mine?]rvior(um) *Flavia[nor(um)]* / [---]enicienii? *p(rincipales?)* / [---]
- 18.(11) a) [---]iati *p(rincipales) a(lmae) K(arthaginis)*
 b) *CE[---?] / NIE[---?] / c(larissimi?) v(iri?)*

- 19.(13)a) [---]i p(rincipalis?) K(arthaginis?) b) CEZ(---?) FVS(---?)
20. [---]IUNI / [---]onii p(rincipalis) K(arthaginis)
- 21.(28)a) [---] p(rincipalis) a(lmae) K(arthagini) b) [---] / Iu[---?]
- 22.(33) [---] AVXA(---?) [---?] 23.(17) [---]a Bonifa(tii?)
- 24.(31) a) [---]amii[---]
b) C(ai?) I(---) vel c(larissimi?) i(uvenis?) / Cres(---) L(---) INII[---?] / [-----] / [-----]
- 25.(15) *Felicitis (nummi?) (duo)*
- Although Ñ is the abbreviation for nummi and follows *Felicitis*, it does not make much sense in this context.
26. [F?]orenti[s---?] 27. T[?](---) Fortuna
- 28.(24) [---] Her[ac]l[---]
- 29.(25)a) I(---) / A(---) L(---) / A(---) b) [--- H?]erac]l[---]
- 30.(18)a) [-----] b) Pompe(ii vel iani)
- 31.(35)a) [---?]ER[---?] b) [---]I[---?] / [---] Posteum[i?]
- 32.(19)a) [-----] / [---]VIVI[---?] b) L(ucii?) Rufinian(i)
- 33.(29) [Ga?]binii [---?] / [---]PI[---]
- 34.(23) [Fus?]ciani [---?] / [---]SYIIA[---]
- 35.(20) [--- Fe?]lici / [---]scellino
- 36.(8) a) [---]LLAL[---] / [---]NIC[---] b) [---]NIO[---]
- 37.(27) [---]PA[---?] / [---]XEM[---?]

38. [- - -?] *BICENIA* vel [- - -?] *RICENIA*
- 39.(30) [- - -] *ani III* [- - -?] vel [- - -] *ANIII* [- - -?]
- 40.(22) [- - -] + *RIANI* [- - -] 41.(34) [- - -] *TEL* [- - -]
- 42.(32) [- - -?] + *IVC* + [- - -?] 43.(21) [- - -] + *VSI* [- - -?]

59. Carthage. Amphitheatre; see above no. **58**. Possibly fragmentary podium inscriptions. *CIL VIII* 24660a-o, listed here in the same order.

1. [- - -?] *ratio Af(ric? - - -) p(rincipalis?) a(lmae?) [K(arthaginis)?]*
2. [*Vo?*] *lussi Ae / miliani / Pruden[tis?]*
3. [- - -] *moni v(iri?) [c(larissimi)?] / Flabiorum / [- - -?] Re(- - -?) Ment[- - -?]*

Cf. no. **58**.3, 4, 5b, 6, 7, 8a, 9, 10, 11, 18b.

4. [- - -?] *LEBVP* [- - -] / [- - -?] *NIIIRL* [- - -]
5. *C(ai?) A(- - -) F(- - -) vel C(ai?) A(- - -) E(- - -)*
6. *A(uli?) E(- - -)* 7. *CA(- - -?) vel C(ai?) A(- - -)* 8. [- - -?] *ROG* [- - -?]
9. [- - -] *NI* [- - -] 10. *R(- - -?) [- - -?] / [- - -?] P(- - -?)* 11. *C(ai?)*
12. *C(ai?)* 13. *C(ai?)* 14. *R(- - -?)*

60. Carthage. Amphitheatre; see above no. **58**. Very fragmentary inscriptions perhaps from seats or podium. *CIL VIII* 24461a-b', listed here in the same order.

1. [- - -?] *EE Fe(- - -) lyl(- - -) / [- - -] lix* 2. [- - -?] *IIIOBSIAR* [- - -?] ; [- - -?] *P* [- - -?]
3. [- - -?] *AT* [- - -?] 4. [- - -?] *BI* [- - -?]
5. [- - -] *EAI* [- - -] vel [- - -] *EAI* [- - -] 6. [- - -?] *Ho* [- - -]

7. [---]IAN[---] 8. [---]IBI[---] 9. [---]IEI[---?]
 10. [---]i F[---] 11. [---]ITI[---]
 12. [---?]F[---] vel [---?] F(---?) ; [---]RV[---] vel R(---) V(---)
 13. [---]LLI[---] 14. [---?] Lo[*cus*?] “Place of?...”
 15. *Loc(us)* “Place of...” 16. [---?]NAP[---?] vel [---?]NAR[---?]
 17. [---?]NIP[---?] ; [---]atis 18. [---?]NIII[---?] ; [---]AEAN[---]
 19. [---]OK[---] 20. [---]REC[---] vel [---]REQ[---]
 21. [---]VL[---] vel V(---) L(---) 22. V(---) M(---)
 23. *Loc(us)* “Place of...” 24. [---]uii F[---] 25. [---]XOO[---]
 26. [---]XIH[---] 27. [---?]XX[---?]

61. Carthage. Theatre seats. The earliest theatre may have been Augustan, but the extant remains are largely Hadrianic in date.

1. *CIL* VIII 24664; Gauckler 1907, no. 352.

[---]+++ / *Lut(atiorum) Aemili / anorum*

2. Gauckler 1907, no. 364. *C(ai?) I(---)* vel *c(larissimi?) i(uvenis?)*

3. *CIL* VIII 24664; Gauckler 1907, no. 353. [---]inciae *Tio*[---]

62. Tebessa (*Thevestis*). Amphitheatre, balustrade of podium. The first phase of construction dates to the fourth quarter of the 1st c. C.E.; the outer rows of seating were added in the late 3rd / early 4th c. C.E. Lequément 1968, nos. 15-53; listed in the same order here.

1. a) [---]T[---] / [---]M I[---] b) *Albinorum*

2. a) [---]S b) *Ambibuliani / Iunioris*

3. *Asclepi / orum* 4. a) *Comasi* b) Vi[---]

5. a) [---]tis b) *Crescen*[---] 6. [---] *Çreşconii*

7. a) [-----] b) *Cumini Ni*[---]

8. a) [---]A[---?] *Ianuariani / ni* b) *Dalmati* c) *Vale*[---]

9. a) [---]oru / m b) *Lampi*(---) c) *Ecl*[---]

10. [---]*EPLEONT II* 11. *LEVCA*[---] 12. *Prohini* [---]

13. a) [--- or?]um b) *Quieti* [---] 14. [*Val?*]eri *Romuliani*

15. a) *Rusticia / ni* b) *Loc(us?)* “place of...”

16. [*R?*]*iusticiani* 17. a) [---]iorum b) *Seleuçanii*

18. a) *Titinni Comasi* b) *EC*[---] 19. [*Val?*]eri *Victoriniani*

20. [*Vic?*]*tor[i]nia[ni]* 21. ASS[---] 22. [---] M[---]/[---]G MAVR[---]

23. [---]*ILIPPI*[---] vel [*Ph?*]*ilippi* [---]

24. a) [---]aniani b) *Fl*[---]

25. a) [---]uris / [---] b) *Opt*[---] 26. *ELI*[---]

27. a) [---o]rum b) *T*[---]

28. a) [---]niani / i b) [---]OR[---] / *Atilos* [---]

29. [---]*LNO VA*[---] 30. [---]iorum [---?]/[---] PR[---?]

31. [---]*RVMCEL*[---] vel [---o?]rum *Cel*[---]

32. [---] P[---] / [---]OSEL[---] / [---]IN[---]

33. [---]I[C]--- / [---]M---

34. [---]R[IP]O---

35. [---]M[IA]NO---

36. [---]V--- / [---] 37. [---]V---

63. Tebessa (*Thevestis*). Amphitheatre seats. The first phase of construction dates to the last quarter of the 1st c. C.E.; the outer rows of seating and stone-cut facade were added in the late 3rd / early 4th c. C.E. Lequément 1968, nos. 54-57, listed in the same order here.

1. [---]CECONIETGTIL--- / [---] *Albino*[rum?]

2. ROMANFSI

3. *Loc(us?)* “place of...”4. *Locus / Festi / ALVNVT*---

“Place of Festus...”

Numidia

64. Lambaesis. Amphitheatre, on the upper rows in the north-east section. The amphitheatre was originally constructed by 128 C.E.; it was restored in the third quarter of the 2nd c. C.E. The inscriptions date to the 3rd c. C.E. *CIL* VIII 3293; Kotula 1968, 39 no. 8.

Fourth row:

Curia Antoniniana

Third row:

<i>C(uneus) VI</i>	<i>C(uneus) VII</i>	<i>C(uneus) VIII</i>	<i>C(uneus) VIII</i>	<i>C(uneus) X</i>
	<i>C(uria) Papir(ia)</i>			
	<i>C(uria) Aur(elia)</i>			

Second row:

C(uria) Saturnia

First row:

C(uria) Aug(usta) *C(uria) Traia(na)*

The members of each of the *curiae*, voting units, seem to have been assigned one row in more than one *cuneus*.

Caria

65. Aphrodisias. Theatre, seat inscriptions. The theatre was originally built in the second half of the 1st c. B.C.E. and the *summa cavea* was added under Antoninus Pius (138-161 C.E.). The *cunei* are numbered from north to south. The vertical lines indicate the divisions between seating blocks. Roueché 1993, cat. 46; *cuneus* 1 corresponds to her *cuneus* A, through to *cuneus* 8 = her *cuneus* H. She omits the letter I in her numbering system, meaning that *cuneus* 9 here = her *cuneus* J, and so on.

Cuneus 1

1. Row 3 τό(πος) μανδ(άτορος) “Place of the *mandator*.”
2. Row 6 [- - -]ΥΠΙΖΙ / ΟΠΥΟΛΛΤΝΙΡΟΥ / ΝΙΑ ΤΟΥΝΙ[- - -]ΙΕΑΟΣ
3. Row 8 ΓΙΖ(- - -?) / Λ(- - -?)
4. Row 10 ΩΕ(- - -?) / Κ vac. Α | [τέχεται?] “...reserved...”
5. Row 18 Η(- - -)
6. Row 20 ΑΚ(- - -) vel Α(- - -) Κ(- - -)
7. Row 24 Αἰνείου τόπος “Place of Aeneas.”
8. Row 26 Ι vac. τόπ[ος] “Place of...”

Cuneus 2

9. Row 15 κ Ρ α[τέχεται] “Reserved ...” The Ρ seems to be from another text.
10. Row 16 vac. ΚΚ vac.
11. Row 19 Ικατ[έχεται] “Reserved ...”

Cuneus 3

12. Row 12 Α monogram containing Η, Τ, Λ, Λ, either a Κ or an Υ and an Ο
13. Row 18 Κακὰ τὰ ἔτη / τῶν Πρασίνων “Bad years for the greens!”
14. Row 21 Ι vac. Ι ΚΑ Ι κατ[έχεται] Ι ΗΤΛ Ι [- - -] “Reserved ...”
15. Row 21 vac. Ι κυκ Ι vac.
16. Row 22 steps Ι gameboard Ι two seats Ι ΑΤ Ι κ(αὶ) Ι ΑΔ Ι ΣΧΠ Ι vac. Ι Χ Ι vac. Ι steps

17. Row 26 τό(πος) Βεγυσίν(ου) “Place of Venusinus.”

Cuneus 4

18. Row 12 | κΥατ | έ | | [χεται] “Reserved ...”
| [- - -] | ΣΑΝ | [- - -]

19. Row 19 ΛΙ / [κ] | Αατέ | [χεται] / ΣΤ “Reserved ...”

20. Row 20 steps | vac. | vac. | ΟΥ | [- - -] | Φ | ΟΝ | cross | cross | vac.

Cuneus 5

21. Row 8 ΖΩ vac. / ΚΟΤΝ vac. / Χ() Π / ΕΠ

At right angles to other script: ΤΥ(- - -) / ΕΥ(- - -)

22. Row 9 i. Νικᾱ ή τύχη τῶν Πρασίνων “The fortune of the Greens triumphs!”
ii. Ἡ τύχη τῶν Πρασίνων “The fortune of the Greens...”

23. Row 11 Νικᾱ ή τύχη τῶν Πρασίνων “The fortune of the Greens triumphs!”

24. Row 15 vac. | Υ Κ Ε Δ | vac. | Κ Χ | Ω | steps

25. Row 24 steps | vac. | vac. | κατ | | [έχεται] “Reserved ...”

Cuneus 6

26. Row 5 [κατέ] | vac. χ vac. εται | “Reserved ...”
| Υ ΙΟΣ

27. Row 6 [- - -] | [-] αρχων κ(αὶ) ΑΕ vac. | [- - -]
| vac. ΑΤΑ vac. |

28. Row 6 [- - -] | vac. Α | vac. ΙΒ vac. | [- - -] IB may be the number 12.

29. Row 6 [- - -] | η
[- - -] | λίας Φλαβ(ίας) | steps

This second text may be either a woman's name, Flavia, or perhaps that of a tribe; the η in the first text does not appear to be related.

30. Row 10 steps | design | ΚαΑΤ | vac. | vac. ΑΙ | vac. | ΚΤ | vac. ΑΙ | steps

31. Row 11 | ΟΡΟΣ vac. | vac. | two seats | steps
| θες | | φιας |

32. Row 16i steps | vac. | Υ Λ Ο Σ |
| Α Π Ο |
| ΑΕ ΥΤ Α Ο Λ |

33. Row 16 [κατέχε]ται “Reserved ...”

34. Row 17 | ΙΙΙ | vac. ΝΙΓ(---?) ΔΙΑ(---?) |

35. Row 18 τόπος / Ἔρωτος “Place of Eros.”

Roueché (107) suggests that this inscription may be a joke rather than an official reservation.

36. Row 22 | Π (ΠΑ) Α | steps ; Τ(---?) Κ / τόπος ΝΑ “...place of...”

37. Row 26 vac. | ΤΤ | vac.

Cuneus 7

38. Row 8 [---] | ΟΤ Λ[---] / ΙΓ(---?) / [---] | ΡΑΣ [---|---]

Each line of this inscription is in a different hand.

39. Row 11 | vac. | Μ [---] ΧΗΝ | [-] | vac. ΙΒ vac. | steps
| ΚΑΤ |

ΙΒ might indicate the number 12; cf. no. 28. The letters in the second line are much larger and seem to be unrelated to the first line, perhaps from κατ[έχεται].

40. Row 12 i. Νικᾶ ἡ τύχη τῶν Βενέτων “The fortune of the Blues triumphs!”
ii. cross τόπος / Σπονδι vac. / Ο(---?) “Place of Spandius.”

Cuneus 8

41. Row 6 ΑΙΤ(---)

42. Row 6 τόπ(ος) cross

This text could be read two ways, either as the place of the cross or as the place of a Christian individual whose name was never cut, meant to be accompanied by a cross.

43. Row 8 [- - -] ᾿Αγαθωπος vac. “(Place of) Agathops.”

44. Row 8 ᾿Επτομην[ί]- / (ου) “(Place of) Heptamenius.”

45. Row 8 Three monograms:

a) Based on E, other letters O, K, A, and Λ or Δ

b) Based on K, other letters O, Y, P: Κουρ[- - -]

c) Based on E; other letters O, Δ or A, N

46. Row 9 ᾿Αθανα / σί(ου) ; Εὐσεβί(ου) “(Place of) Athanasius; (Place of) Eusebius.”

47. Row 9 τό(πος) Εὐ[σε]β[ίου] “Place of Eusebius.”

48. Row 19 steps | [κατέ]χεται ὕ | [πὸ - - -] “Reserved by(?)...”

49. Row 19 [- - -] | ΑΠΟΨΟΥ vac. / [- - -] | κατέχετ[αι]

“Wipe (the seat) clean(?) / Reserved...” Roueché (110) suggests that the first line may come from ἀποψάω, to wipe off or wipe clean.

50. Row 20 steps | two seats | κτ|α|τέχ[|εται] “Reserved...”

51. Row 20 vac. τόπ(ος) | steps “Place of...”

52. Row 22 steps | three seats | ὕπὸ | κα | Π vac. Λ | three seats | V | K | T | [- - -] steps

53. Row 23 | ΚΔΙΡΟ | ε | | Θ | two seats | steps

| ΝΟΡΟΥ | [-] | [κ]ατέχεται |

“...reserved...”

54. Row 25 [κατέχετ[α?]] | ὕπὸ Π [- - -] “Reserved for...”

Cuneus 9

55. Row 2 vac. Ἡλιοδώρ(ου) “(Place of) Heliodorus.”

56. Row 8; cf. Roueché 1995, no. 2.

a) τοῦ κὲ / Κολοτρο- / νος b) νικᾷ ἡ τύχη / Θεοδότου / προταυ- / ραρίου

“The fortune triumphs of Theodotus, first goldsmith. . . . also called Kolotron.”

The above texts were cut on either side of a graffito of a head. It seems likely that the text on the left (a) is the remainder of an inscription which started on another seat and is unrelated to that for Θεοδότος (b).

57. Row 13 τόπο(ς) τῶν μακελλίτων / Νικᾷ ἡ τύχη τῶν Βενέτων

“Place of the butchers. The fortune of the Blues triumphs!”

58. Row 23 [- - -]ΜΟΥ[- - -?] / [- - -]ΦΟΥ[- - -?]

59. Row 23 A monogram based on K and E, with perhaps T and I

60. Row 26 vac. | μνίου ΛΥ(- - -?) | vac. 61. Row 26 [- - -] | ΙΤΙ | [- - -]

62. Row 26 [- - -] | ΑΔΙΤ | [- - -]

Cuneus 10

63. Row 6 vac. | ΚΕΑΤΥΙΩΝ

64. Row 8 NHAI

65. Row 21 steps | vac. | Τ | vac. | Ο | vac. | vac. | Ν | Ι | Υ | vac. | steps

This text could be τό(πος) followed by the name of a group or of an individual.

66. Row 22 Monogram based on K and E, with Λ and perhaps T

67. In the steps leading upwards between blocks K and L

a) Fourteenth step: A

b) Seventeenth step: Δ?

Roueché (113) suggests that these letters might be numbers, 1 and possibly 4, indicating the seat rows.

Cuneus 11

68. Row 6 vac. ΕΓ(- - -) vac.

69. Row 7 steps | τόπος Βεγγέτων | “Place of the Blues.”

70. Row 18 vac. | vac. Π vac. | vac. ΠΑΘ [- - -] | vac. | steps

71. Row 19 steps | three seats | Τ Ι ΧΡΥΣ(ΟΥ) [-] vac. | steps

72. Row 21 steps | X | vac. | [-] | vac. | Ω | vac.

Ex situ

73. Seat with back, standing in front row a) A K(- - -?) / Φ A Π(- - -?)
b) [- - -] | Φ Λ [-] ΝΤΕΙΧ | [- - -]

74. Seat with back vac. ΕΙΣΦΟΡΙΝ 75. Seat with back | ΗΛΙΑΝ(- - -?)

76. Νικᾷ ἡ τύχη τ[ῶ]ν Πρασίνων “The fortune of the Greens triumphs!”

77 Seat from the *summa cavea* vac. κατέχετα | [ι - - ?] “...reserved...”

78. [- - - ? ’Απ] vac. φία κ(αὶ) Φλ(άβιος) Ἑρμιπ[πος - - -?]

79. Seat with back | κατ[έ]χεται ? | / ΙΟΥ [- - -] “Reserved...”

80. [- - -] | ΧΙΟΥ 81. Seat with back [- - -] | [- - -] | [- - -] / [- - -] | [-] ΟΥΛΑΛΟ [- - -]

82. vac. ΕΥΑΤ vac. 83. vac. ΓΟ(- - -?) vac. ΑΙ(- - -?) vac.

84. vac. ΖΩ(- - -?) vac. 85. [- - -] Λ Η(- - -?) vac.

86. κατέχεται / μὴ μάχη H(- - ?) “Reserved. Don’t quarrel.”

The second line is intriguing since it seems to be instructing the viewer not to argue over the occupancy of the seat. The final H is from an unrelated text.

87. Appears to be from the upper *cavea* vac. ΔΗΜΗ vac.

88. Appears to be from the upper *cavea*

- a) in “a large sprawling hand” M(- - -)
- b) in formal lettering Κορμινίας Κλαυδ[ι]ωνης vac.

Carminia Claudiana must be a member of the Carminii, a prominent family at Aphrodisias from the mid-second century. Marcus Ulpius Carminius Claudianus spent 10,000 denarii on the *cavea* of the theatre, perhaps explaining why Carminia was given the honour of an officially reserved seat inscribed with formal lettering (Roueché, 117; Lewis 1974, 91M).

66. Aphrodisias. Odeon seats. The odeon dates to the late 1st / early 2nd c. C.E.; it was reconstructed in 4th c. C.E. The *cunei* are numbered from west to east. The vertical lines indicate the divisions between seating blocks. Roueché 1993, cat. 47; *cuneus* 1 corresponds to her *cuneus* A.

1. A series of groups of letters on the front lips of the seats; they are found only in one section of the *cavea* because elsewhere the edges of the seats have been lost.

- a) ΑΔΡ: *cuneus* 2 rows 4, 5, 6 (found four times on seat), 7, loose fragments
- b) ΑΛΕ: *cuneus* 2 row 7
- c) ΑΝ: *cuneus* 5 rows 7, 8, loose fragment
- d) ΑΡΑΡ: *cuneus* 2 row 4
- e) ΓΟ: *cuneus* 2 row 1
- f) ΕΡ: *cuneus* 2 row 5
- g) ΖΗ: *cuneus* 2 rows 4 (twice), 5, *cuneus* 3 row 4
- h) ΗΡΑ: *cuneus* 5 row 7
- i) ΗΡΙ: *cuneus* 2 row 6 (twice)
- j) ΠΑΛ: loose fragment

2. *Cuneus* 2, row 5 τόπος νεοτέρων[v] “Place of the younger men.”

3. *Cuneus* 2, row 8 τόπος Ἑβραίων “Place of the Jews.”

4. *Cuneus* 4 row 6 τόπος Βενέτων / Ἑβρέων τῶν πρᾶτων

“Place of the Blues, of the elder Jews.”

5. *Cuneus* 5 row 5 [- - -] Βενέτου “...of the Blue faction(?)”

6. *Cuneus* 5 row 7 τόπος Βενέ(των) “Place of the Blues.”

67. Aphrodisias. Stadium seats. The stadium was built in the mid- to late 1st c. C.E. The *cunei* are numbered anticlockwise beginning with the *cuneus* over the eastern entrance. The vertical lines indicate the divisions between seating blocks. Roueché 1993, cat. 45.

1. *Cuneus* 1 row 25 Α(- - -)

2. *Cuneus* 2 row 13 τόπος[-][-]Φ[-]ΛΙΟΙ[-]ΙΙ[-]ΙΙΝ ΙΡΝ Ιvacat “Place of...”

3. *Cuneus* 2 row 20 τό[π]ο[ς] ΦΥΛ ΙΟΙΡ [- - -] “Place of...”

Roueché (85) suggests that the seat could be reserved for either a φύλη or supporters, φιλορ-.

4. *Cuneus* 2 row 21 φρουμ(εντορίων ?) τόπο(ς) Ι vacat

“Place of the corn-dealers.” Roueché (85) suggests that one interpretation of this text indicates that the seats were reserved for *frumentarii*, corn-dealers (and not the government agents), but admits that she knows of no other instances of the word being used in this manner in Greek.

5. *Cuneus* 3 row 10 vacat Ι NT vacat

6. *Cuneus* 3 row 11 Ι ΙΙΙΙ Βενέ Ι
vacat Ι Ι των Ι vacat
Ι Αὐρ[- - -] ΛΛΟ ΙΙΙ ENION Ι

“(Place of) the Blues...”

7. *Cuneus* 3 row 16 steps Ι τ Ι ό Ι π (ος) Ι [- - -] “Place of...”

8. *Cuneus* 3 row 22 τόπος | Ἀνδρονικοῦ | [τ]οῦ καὶ | Φοιβερίου

“Place of Andronicus, also called Phoeberius.”

9. *Cuneus* 3 row 22 τόπ(ος) [- - -] “Place of...”

This inscription is unfinished and seems to have been carved by a spectator rather than because of an official grant (Roueché, 86).

10. *Cuneus* 4 row 1 [- - -] ΟΙΕΡΚΩΝ Πρασίν[ων] “...of the Greens.”

11. *Cuneus* 4 row 15 vacat | τόπος | Μασταυρελ[ιτῶν]

“Place of the Mastaureitans.” This inscription reserves seats for the citizens of Mastaura in Lydia.

12. *Cuneus* 7 row 13 steps | [- - -] ΜΙΟΥΤΡΑΙΤΟΥ | vacat

This text may be the end of a name such as Δημοστράτου.

13. *Cuneus* 7 row 22 steps | [-] ΒΙΟΙΛ | σιέων | vacat

14. *Cuneus* 7 row 24 [Ἀπολλ]ωνίου [ἀ]γα [λ]ματογλύφου

“Place of Apollonius, sculptor.”

15. *Cuneus* 8 row 10 [- - -] | Ο | vac. | vac. | Τ | vac. | vac. | Ι ΠΙΤ | steps

16. *Cuneus* 8 row 17 [- - -] | Ε Π Ι | vac. | Ι | steps

17. *Cuneus* 8 row 18 [- - -] | ΜΙΩ | Ν | steps

18. *Cuneus* 10 row 16 τόπος | ΦΙΛΩΒ | [-] Ν | [- - -] “Place of...”

This could be referring to supporters; Roueché (88) suggests perhaps φιλοβένετοι, a new description of a supporter of the Blues.

19. *Cuneus* 10 row 24 a) vac. ΟΥΕ vac. | b) ΤΛΥΙΝ |

20. *Cuneus* 10 row 25 |[- - -]|Κλ(αυδίας)Σελευκείας τό(πος)|[-]Χ ΙΡ ΙΥΣ |[- - -]

“Place of Claudia Seleuceia...” Although a city in Pisidia is named Claudia Seleucia, it is more likely that this inscription is reserving an area for a woman named Claudia Seleucia, since seats reserved for cities give the name in the genitive plural (Roueché, 89). The inscription is spread out over at least three seats.

21. *Cuneus* 10 row 25 [τόπος]|τῆς σὺν τεχν[νίας]|.ΙΙΟ[- - -]Α|[- - -]ΙΙ|[- - -]

“Place of the association of...” This inscription is on the rim of some of the same seats as the inscription for Claudia Seleucia and may date to a different time, an example of the reuse of seats. Alternatively, van Nijf (1997, 222-223) suggests instead that the entire row was reserved for Claudia Seleucia and that as a benefactor to the unknown association she allowed some of its members to sit in her row.

22. *Cuneus* 11 row 6 [- - -]ΑΥΡΙ |[- - -]οἰκονόμου vac.|vac.| seat of honour

“Place of Aurelius(?)...*oeconomus*.”

23. *Cuneus* 11 row 7 τόπ[ος] |[- - -]Υ οἰκονόμ(ου) | vac.

“Place of ...*oeconomus*.”

24. *Cuneus* 11 row 8 [- - -] vac. Μ|ΟΥ vac. ΙΙΜΟΥ vac. |

25. *Cuneus* 11 row 14 steps |[- - -]|ΙΤΕΑΣ |[-] | vac. ΑΥ |[-] | vac. ΦΙΑ |[- - -]

26. *Cuneus* 11 row 21 steps |[- - -]|ΙΟΥ ΤΕΙΙΙ |[-]ΙΕΗΓ | του | vac. Ἰγνατ[vac.] | ἰη καὶ
Υψικλεῖς [- - -]ΙΟΚΙΝ [- - -]Ιωνου |[- - -]

“...Ignatia and Hypsicles...”

27. *Cuneus* 12 row 1 | vacat ΑΠΟ |[- - -]

28. *Cuneus* 12 row 4 Υ β|υ|ρ | vac. | σ|έ|ω|ν|σ|υ| | ντεχνία

“(Place of) The association of tanners.”

29. *Cuneus* 12 row 8

steps | [- - -] | I Y | [-] T E | [- - -] | ων | five seats | μ vac. εἰ | λ^ς τ | [ό]π[ος] | steps

“Place of the Milesians *or* of Miletus(?)” This inscription may be reserving seats for individuals from Miletus.

30. *Cuneus* 12 row 10 | [- -] | K Y | I [-] | [-] E Ω P | I | [- - -]

31. *Cuneus* 12 row 12 Αἰ | λι | α | νοῦ | vac.

32. *Cuneus* 12 row 13 steps | [-] Γ | [- -] | [-] E | ὁ | α ρ | ά σ | του | τό (πος?) | NHC |

“Place of Eurastus.”

33. *Cuneus* 12 row 18 vac. | τό π (ος) | [’ A] ν τ ι γ ό | νο [υ] | vac.

“Place of Antigonus.” This name is not otherwise attested at Aphrodisias (Roueché, 91).

34. *Cuneus* 13 row 4 Λυ (- - -)

This inscription should be understood as reserving the whole row; cf. nos. 44, 45, 46, and 47 also from the stadium. Although the letters could stand for Ly(simachus) or another name of an individual, it seems instead that this inscription is an abbreviation for some sort of group. Roueché (1993, 91) suggests that this group might be from outside Aphrodisias, such as the Ly(cians) or Ly(dians); alternatively it could be a civic tribe, since the abbreviation must represent something easily understood by spectators.

35. *Cuneus* 13 row 15 steps | E P | [-] | K | Y | [-] | [- -] M | [- -] | E | T | P | IO | Y | steps

36. *Cuneus* 13 row 18 [- - -] | [- - -] | Δ Υ Ο Υ vac. Π Π vac. | steps

37. *Cuneus* 14 row 10 steps | M | A | C | [- - -]

38. *Cuneus* 14 row 22 [- - -] | vac. Α Λ (- - -) vac. [- - -] | [- - -]

39. *Cuneus* 14 row 23, on the rims of several seats

steps | vac. | vac. Ω vac. | vac. | vac. P vac. | [- - -]

40. *Cuneus* 14 row 24, on the rims of several seats

steps | vac. OP vac. | AB ῥΗρωδτα vac. | γ[οῦ - -] | [-?] | [-]P vac. | 3 seats |
vac. Ω [- -]

41. *Cuneus* 15 row 26 vac. | IA | IA | [- -] | AI | AI | [- -] | steps

These letters could be different combinations of the number eleven.

42. *Cuneus* 18 row 6 A monogram composed of the letters PTXANE or OTXANE.

43. *Cuneus* 21 row 13 steps | τό | π | [ος - -] “Place of...”

44. *Cuneus* 28 row 2 | vac. ῥΥψι(- - -)vac. | steps

45. *Cuneus* 28 row 3 | ῥΥψι(- - -) vac. |

Nos. 44 and 45 are perhaps abbreviations for a group; cf. nos. 34, 46, and 47.

46. *Cuneus* 28 row 12, found on the seats at either end of the row AP(- - -?)

47. *Cuneus* 28 row 18, found on the seats at either end of the row AI(- - -?)

Nos. 46 and 47 are most likely abbreviations for the names of groups. AP is also found in the odeon (66.1), and two combinations of AI are found elsewhere in this stadium (no. 41).

48. *Cuneus* 29 row 27 steps | B | A | [- -]

49. *Cuneus* 30 row 18 steps | ἱε | vac. | [ρ]ῶ | ν | ο | ἱ | κ | ο | ν | ο | μ | ω | ν | steps

“(Place of) the sacred *oeconomi*.” Roueché (95) suggests that these individuals may be the *oeconomi* of the goddess Aphrodite; cf. no. 51.

50. *Cuneus* 30 row 19 steps | τό | πος | οἱ | κον | όμ | ω | ν | ν | εω | τέ | ρω | ν | vac. |

“Place of the *oeconomi* of the younger men *or* of the younger *oeconomi*.”

51. *Cuneus* 30 row 20 steps | ἱε | ρ | ὠ | ν | ρ | ἱ | κ | vac. | ὁ | [μ] | ω | ν | [- - -]

“(Place of) the sacred *oeconomi*.”

52. *Cuneus* 30 row 21 steps | ἱ | ε | ρ | ὠ | ν | vac. | ἔ | [φ] | ῥ | vac. | β | ω | vac. | ν | vac. |

“(Place of) the sacred ephebes.”

53. *Cuneus* 30 row 22 steps | ἱε | ρ | ὠ | ν | ἔ | φ | ῥ | β | ω | ν | vac. | ἔ | vac. | φ | vac. | ῥ | vac. | vac. | β | vac. | ω | ν | steps

“(Place of) the sacred ephebes...” Nos. 51 and 52 are the only instances of which Roueché (95) is aware in which ephebes are described as sacred, and she suggests that this may only apply to a particular subgroup.

54. *Cuneus* 32 row 19 steps | three seats | ῥ | Α | ρ | ι | [σ] | τ | ἰ | ω | ν | ο | σ | vac.

55. *Cuneus* 32 row 25 steps | τ | ὁ | vac. | π | ο | σ | vac. | φ | υ | vac. | λ | ὠ | ν | vac. | ῥ | Α | vac. | φ | ρ | ο | vac. | δ | ε | ι | σ | ι | [έ] | ω | ν | vac.

“Place of the Aphrodisian tribes.” One row could not have seated all the tribes of the city, therefore these seats must have been reserved for particular members or officials of the tribes (Roueché, 95).

56. *Cuneus* 33 row 8 steps | [ῥ Α] | τ | τ | ᾠ | λ | ο | υ | σ | υ | [ν] | κ | λ | η | τ | ι | κ | (οὔ) | steps

“(Place of) Attalus, senator.” All senators from the city with this name are from the mid-second century (Roueché, 96).

57. *Cuneus* 33 row 16 [- - -] | Ι Α | vac. | Λ Η Ι | steps
| P |

58. *Cuneus* 33 row 18 [- - -] | Q | [-] | [-] | ῥ Ε | π | ι | γ | ὁ | ν | [ου] | [- -] | steps

59. *Cuneus* 33 row 19 steps | vac. | ῥ Α | π | ο | λ | λ | ω | ν | ί | ο | υ | Ε Ι | 5 seats | Η | palm | steps

“(Place of) Apollonius...” The palm, a symbol of victory, might indicate that Apollonius was a victor, suggesting that the inscription could be restored as εἰ[ε]ρονείκου] (Roueché 1993, 96).

60. *Cuneus* 33 row 20 | ZBI | two seats | steps

61. *Cuneus* 33 row 27

steps | [-] | [-]N | [-] | τ | ο | νί | κη | Σ π palm υ(κτοῦ) | [-] Α | ν | ου | 4 seats | steps

Roueché (96) suggests that the individual seated here was probably a boxer; the sigma, which is lunate, may instead be an abbreviation mark.

62. *Cuneus* 34 row 19 steps | [-] | [-] | [-] | [ʹ Α] | γ | τ | ι | ρ | χ | ε | [ί] | ω | ν | steps

“(Place of) the people of Antiocheia.” This inscription seems to reserve an area for the citizens of Antioch on the Maeander.

63. *Cuneus* 34 row 26 steps | σ | ο | υ | ν | τ | ε | χ | ν | ί | α | vac. | κ | η | π | ο | ο | ρ(ῶν) |

“The association of gardeners.”

64. *Cuneus* 35 row 12 steps | vac. | vac. | KIB | vac. Α | [- - -]

Roueché (97) suggests that this inscription could be reserving an area for individuals from Kibyra in Phrygia.

65. *Cuneus* 37 row 5 Ιʹ Αδράσ | του | τ[ό]π(ος) | vac. “Place of Adrastus.”

66. *Cuneus* 38 row 3 vac. Κχι vac. vel Κχι

67. *Cuneus* 39 row 16 vac. | τόπ | ος vac. | αὐραρί | ων vac. | steps

“Place of the gold-workers.” Α προτοαυραρίος – the leader of the αὐραρίοι – had his own seat in the theatre (65.56b), and αὐραρίοι were also granted seats in the theatre of Miletus (71.1-4).

68. *Cuneus* 40 row 19 steps | vac. | Πα | πίω | [ν] | ος | τ(όπος) | Δ vac. | vac. [- - -]

“Place of Papion...”

Seats found *ex situ*

69. τόπος “Place of...” 70. τόπος “Place of...”

71. vac. ΕΠ(---) vac.

72. vac. ΕΡΖΗ(---?) vac.

73. vac. ΛΑΡΙΚΤΝΙ (---?) vac.

74. ἡ πατρίς “The fatherland...”

Ionia

68. Didyma. Stadium seats. The Hellenistic stadium is within the sanctuary to Apollo, and all but one of the seating inscriptions that have survived come from the steps to the temple platform which were used as seats for the stadium. Most seats on the other side of the stadium are now lost. The rows are numbered from the bottom, and the seat blocks from west to east unless otherwise indicated. The relationship between various inscriptions on the same seat block is not always clearly defined in Rehm’s catalogue. Vertical lines represent the divisions between seat blocks. Rehm 1958, no. 50, listed here in the same order.

There are two terms in the inscriptions that indicate unknown types of group, seemingly organized around individuals, τρικλινον, technically a dining room with three couches, and its variants (nos. 1.18, 1.30, 1.43b, 1.48, 1.50, 2.3, 2.10b, 2.30, 2.32a, 2.38, 2.42, 3.1) and τῶν περί, “those around...” (nos. 1.6, 1.15, 1.39, 1.44, 2.21, 2.37, 2.50, 3.16). The προφῆται, priests of Apollo, were elected annually from the leading families of Miletus; five candidates were nominated by each of the five local demes and then in a second vote the final choice was made (Parke 1986, 124; Jones 1987, 326). Several inscriptions from the stadium contain ἐπί and it seems that this term was used to indicate that a seat had been officially reserved by the authority of the *prophetes* in office. This term is explicitly linked with this office in several inscriptions (1.3, 1.7, 1.18, 1.38, 1.39, 1.40, 2.26a, 2.35, 2.42, 3.11). Rehm (1958, 102) suggests that ἀπό, which is found in three inscriptions (1.43b, 2.39, 3.8) and is in two (1.43b, 3.8) associated explicitly with the office of *prophetes*, indicates that the seat was reserved from the year in which the *prophetes* named held office onward. This insistence on the specific year, however, may not be necessary and the term should instead be taken to indicate more generally that the seat was reserved during the tenure of the office of *prophetes* by the individual named onward. The inscriptions from the stadium of Didyma on several occasions use formulae not found elsewhere whose meaning is difficult to ascertain, and the texts seem to be a mix of official reservations and personal graffiti, making their interpretation even more challenging.

1. Row 1

1.a) Ἐπαρχου ; Χιόνι(δος) [---]

b) vertical face Ε[-]ομένου

“(Place of) the commander *or* overseer.”

2. Σφοδρίας ; Οὐεργιλ[ί]ου

3. ἐπὶ Λυκίνου προφήτου / Διαδουμενοῦ 4. Τρύφονος
5. Φίλωνος καὶ Ποσιδωνίου ; ἐπὶ Φιλοστράτου
6. τῶν περὶ τὸ Μολπᾶν ΣΙΤΑΝ χωρί(ον?) “The place of those around Molpan(?)...”
7. [Δ]ιοτίμη(ου?) πονι ἐπιγεγραμ(- - -) ; ἐπὶ Στράτωνος προφήτου(?) Διοσκουρίδου ; ἐπὶ Φιλίδου
- The first text may be referring in some manner to the inscribing of the seat.
8. Θεοκ[λ]έο(υς) ; ἐπὶ Στράτωνος προφήτου(?) Φιλοστράτου
9. ἐπὶ Χά(ρμου?) / Διοσκουρί(δου)
10. ἐπὶ Ἀτ[τικοῦ] / Ποπλίου ; ἐπὶ Ἀττικ(οῦ) ; [- - -?]ου[- - -?] μα[- - -?] ἐπὶ Φιλ(ί)δ(ου)
11. [- - -]Φιλοστ(ράτου) / Διηρίου / Μαιανδρίου ; Φιλοστράτου
12. Σηί(ου) 13. [- - -] ἐπὶ Σωπόλεως ; τοὺς ἱερού(ς) “...the priests...”
14. Διονυσίου 15. ἐπὶ τ{ε}ῶν περὶ Ἀρτέμω(να?) / Ἀπιο(- - -?)
16. Δημητρίου(υ) ; ἐπὶ Τέλλ[ου]
17. ἐπὶ Χάρ(μ)ο(υ) Φιλέου ; ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ Δημητρίου ; ἐπὶ Σωφάνου ; Δημητρίου / τοῦ Πυλαιμένου
18. Ἐφεσί(ου) ; ἐπὶ Σωπόλι(ου) Λευκείου ; Ἀπολλωιδόρου / ἐπὶ Μενίπο(υ) Ποπλίου / προφήτου τρεῖς κλίεινον
19. Ἀλκινόου ; ἐπὶ Ἀριστέου ; Ἑκαταίου ; Νικομήδου ; Γαίου
20. ἐπὶ Σω - / [φ]άν(ου) ; Πραξίου ; ἐπὶ Ἀτ[τικοῦ]
21. Πραξίου ; Πραξίου ; τῶν Δηρίνου / ἐπὶ Μενί(σ)κου ; Πραξίου ; Ἀναξαι
- 22.a) ἐπὶ Μενίππου b) vertical rise Ἑρμίου ; ἐπὶ Σωφάνου Κλεάνδρου

23. ἐπὶ Ἰοχίου ; Ἀντιγόνου τρῖς ἀγωδοῦ “(Place of) the tragic actor Antigonos.”

24. Ἑρμώναιος

25.a) ἐπὶ Ἰουνίου τοῦ / Δαμᾶ καὶ Στάχμος ; ἐπὶ Νικομήδου / Φιλέου Ἀνδ(ρ)ίου ; ἐπὶ Θέωνος Διμιτ(ρίου?)

b) vertical face Αὐρηλίου

26. Κλέανδρου ; Τυρωτῶν 27. ἐπὶ Φιλοστράτου / Ἑρμίου ; Ἀντιόχου

28. Νικ[κ]ο[μ]ήδου ; Ἐπιγόνου ; [Π]οπλίου Καρρουνίου ; Δηρίνου

29. Οὐλιάδου καὶ / Ἰατροῦ / εἰς(δος?)

30. Ἐπιγόνου τοῦ Σω(---) ; νεοτρίκλινον? ; ἐπὶ Φιλοστράτου Διονυσίου ; ἐπὶ Θέωνος Ἑρμίου

The term here that has been expanded as νεοτρίκλινον may represent some sort of newer grouping or perhaps a group of young men; cf. no. 1.48.

31. Μέντα(---) ; (ἐπὶ) Ἀντιόχου

32.a) Σωφάνους Later texts: ἐπὶ Ἰουνίου ; ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ Γαίου / Συμμάχου

b) vertical rise Δημητρίου

33. (ἐπὶ) Χαλπίου Later texts: [ἐπὶ] Φανίου / τῶν περὶ ; ἐπὶ Ἀρτέμωνος / Λυσιμάχου

34.a) [---]εἰς ἀνακτῶν ; Λυσιμάχου ; Πόπιος Φιλέου(ς)

b) vertical rise Ἀντιγόνου

35. Θέωνος ἐν χρόνῳ / [---]ιδοντος ; Ἀνδρονίκου

36. Γναίου ; Ἐπιγόνου εἰεροῦ ; Ἀντιπάτρου “(Place of) the priest Epigonos.”

37. ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ / Γαίου / Ἀντιόχου ; ἐπὶ Θέωνος ; Ἀγαθοῦ(ος) ; Παιδίου

38. Εὐαγγέλου καὶ Δαμᾶ ; ἐπὶ προφήτου Ἀπωλλὰ ; νιου

The addition of νιου seems to be a correction on the part of the lapicide to alter Ἀπωλλὰ into Ἀπωλλωνίου.

39. ἐπὶ Ἀριστωμάχου ; τῶν περὶ Θεοδότου τοῦ Ἀγρίου ἐπὶ προφή[τ]ου Εὐγ(---)

40.a) ἐπὶ Χάρμου ; ἐπὶ [Ξ]ενοκλέου ; ἐπὶ Μητροδώρου προφ[ήτ]ου / θεοσ(εβ)ου(ς)

The third text: “(Reserved) during the tenure of office of god-fearing(?) *prophetes* by Metrodorus (?).” The term appears in Miletus as well, but in a different context; cf. **71.12, .15.**

b) Λυσιμάχου τοῦ πατρός / ἐπὶ προφήτου

41. Σηίο(υ) ; Νικίου Πρόκλου / ἐπὶ Φιλ(---) Φλακκήϊου

42. Ἀπολλοδότ[η]ου

43.a) Φιλίσκου ; Μενεκλέους ; ἐπὶ Ἀριστ[ό]του Φιλίσκου

b) vertical rise Εὐδόξου καὶ Ὀλύμπου νεωκάρων τὸ τρίκλινον / ἀπὸ Ἀρτέμωνος προφήτου

“(The place of) the grouping of Eudoxus and Olympus, guardians of the temple, from the tenure of office of *prophetes* by Artemon(?)”

44. ἐπὶ Φιλίδου τῶν περὶ Πολίωνα

45.a) ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ Γαίου τοῦ τῶν ; Ἑρμωνακτ[ος] ; [Ἀ]πολλωνίου

b) vertical rise Ἑρμου

46.a) Λυσιμάχου ; Ἑκατοδώρου / το(ῦ) Θρασυνίδου

b) vertical rise Θεοδώρου / τοῦ Ἐπινίκου

47. Ἀντιόχου Replaced by: Ἐπιγόνου Another later text: Παισανίου

48. νεοτρικλινό(ν) ; Ἐπιγόνου ; γυμνασιάρχ(ου)

The term here that has been expanded as νεοτρίκλινον may represent some sort of newer grouping or perhaps a group of young men; cf. no. 1.30. “(Place of) the gymnasiarch.”

49. Ὀδίου ; Νέστοροσ ; Ἡρᾶδοσ ; Ἀντιπάτρου καὶ Ἰσᾶ χωρηγῶν / Βάσσου Πραι(- - -)
Φε[ίδ?]ωνος

“(Place of?) the chorus-leaders Antipater and Isas...”

50. ἐπὶ Διονυσίου / τ[ρίκ]λ[ινιο]ν Ἡ(ρ)ακλίδου ; [- - -] καὶ Μενεκλέους ; Νέστοροσ

51. Ἀριστεύου{ς} καλῶ

This text appears to be a personal graffito, referring to a place for “Aristeus the handsome”.

52. Λευκίου / τοῦ Σ[ατορνί?]νοῦ ; Λευκίου [- - -] Σατορνίλου ; Ἀντιόχου ; Δίωνος τὰ
Ἀλεξᾶ

53. Ἀρχελάου ; ἐπὶ Τέ[λ]λου

54. [- - -]ρτέλου vel [- - -]ρτενου

55. Ἡγε(- - -) ; [Ἐ]πηγίνου ; Ο[- - -]Ι[-]ΥΟΥ[- - -]Σ

56. Θεουδᾶ(ς?)

57. Μάρκου κ[υρ]τωτου

Rehm suggests instead κυρτωτοῦ, “hunch-backed”, and the inscription appears to be a joke.

58. Θεουδᾶ(ς?) ἀθρ(- - -)

59. διελάσης

From διελαύνω, this term is equestrian in nature and may refer to an *eques*.

60. Ἡγῆλ μάνδρου / τοῦ Ἡγῆμάλινδρου

61. νίκη Κ(- - -) Τιβειρείων ; Ἀττάλου

“The ... triumphs of the *Tiberioi*.” The Τιβειρεῖοι were involved in a cult association for the emperor Tiberius.

2. Row 2

1. ἐπὶ Πλειστάρ[χ?]/ου Χιόνι(δοσ)

2. [Ἐ]πιγόνου

3. Ἄρτεμισίου τὸ τρίκλινον ; Διονυσοδώριου

4. [- - -]εάρχου 5. Μάρκου τόπος “Place of Marcus.”

6. ἐπὶ Λουκίου Μολιραγένους ἐπὶ Ἀρισ(τομάχου?)

7.a) ἐπὶ Χάρμου b) vertical rise Φαίδ[ρ]ου / ἄρχι ἐφηβεύση

“(Place of) Phaidrus, the leader of the ephebes.”

8. Ἀπολλᾶ εἰφσου ; Ἑρμίου 9. ἡ Ερμου(?)

10.a) Ἀρτέμ[ω]νος καὶ Λ(- - -)

b) vertical rise ἐπὶ Φιλοστράτου Εὐφήμου τῖς κλινον

11.a) ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ Δίωνος καὶ AP[- - -]ΟΥ

b) vertical rise Μάρκου ; [- - -]υρσου ; ἱερωνικῶν “(Place of) the sacred victors.”

12.a) [Π]οπλίου

b) vertical rise Ὀνοπηγά(ν)ου ἐπ[ὶ] Σω[φά]νου / ἐπὶ Σωφάνου Ὀνοπηγά(ν)ου

13.a) [Σ]τράτ[ω]νος b) vertical rise ἐπὶ Θέωνος

14.a) Μητρ[ο]δ(ώρου) b) vertical rise ἐπὶ Θέωνος Φωτίδου

15. [Θ]ρασωνίδου ; Γαίου

16. Εἰσᾶ This appears to be the first person singular aorist indicative active of ἵζω, to sit, and therefore should be seen as a personal, rather than official, inscription.

17. [- - -]φάνου 18.a) ἐπὶ Φιλοστράτου Μητροδώρου
b) vertical rise Μηνοφίλου

19. Δομα[σί]ου 20.a) ἐπὶ Φιλίδου b) vertical rise ἐπὶ Ἀτελίου Ἀπολλᾶ

21. ἐπὶ Ἴον(- - -) 22. Τε[ι]μο[κρά]του ; τῶν περὶ Ἰ[σ]τοκράτην καὶ Δ[η]μό[κ]ωνα

23. [᾽Αν]τιόχο[υ] ; [- - -]ωνος ἐπὶ Φιλί|δου Τ[- - -]Α

24. Μάγ(νου?) / ὁ τόπος ; ᾽Ανδροκλέους ἐπὶ Φιλίδ|ου / ᾽Ανδροκλέους ἐπὶ
Φιλοστράτου

“Place of Magnus.”

25. ἐπὶ Φιλοστρ(άτου)

26.a) Κρής b) vertical face Καλικ|λύτου ; ἐπὶ προφήτου Σωφάνου Ἑρμίου Ἀγρίου

27.a) Ἀχερδείωνων ; Κτησίου ; Φιλον(- - -?)

b) ᾽Αλεξᾱ ὁ τόπος ἐπὶ ᾽Α(ρ)τεμίου

b) is an unusual inscription. The name Alexas occurs on other seats (1.52, 2.32b, 3.14b), and on one of these seats (3.14b) the inscription reads ᾽Αλεξᾱ ὁ τόπος. Although Alexas is never explicitly identified as a *prophetes*, the repetition of the name, a pattern found with *prophetai*, suggests that this individual did indeed hold the office. It seems unlikely that Alexas would have had four reserved seats, and instead what may be occurring is that four seats were reserved during his tenure of office. The inclusion in this inscription, however, of an ἐπὶ associated with Artemius does complicate matters since this appears to be the formula used to indicate that a seat was reserved during the tenure of office of *prophetes*, although the name Artemius does not appear elsewhere in the stadium (nor does Atellius, Rehm’s suggestion for an alternative reading). The formula of a name plus *topos* is found elsewhere aside from 3.14: 2.5, 2.24, and even more confusingly in 4.6. *Prima facie* the translation of this inscription seems to be “The place of Alexas during the tenure of office of *prophetes* of Artemius”, although it is not entirely satisfying.

28. ᾽Ανδρωνος

29.a) Πο(σι)δωνίου πύ|ννου ; Φιλίσκου

Πύννος is related to πουνιάζειν, having to do with the practice of pederasty; this inscription seems to be a joke.

b) vertical rise Λομπίτου

30. τρίκ[λ]ινον Ἑρᾱδος

31. [Δ]ιονυσίου

32.a) τρί|κ(λινον) ; τρίκ|λινον b) ἐπὶ Πλειστάρ|χου'Ρούφου ; 'Αλεξῶ ; Ζωΐλου

33. τοῦ'Αριστέου ; 'Αρίστωνος ἐπὶ Λευκίου ; ἐπὶ 'Αρισ(τωνος?)|Καπίτωνος

34. Σωφάνους ; Λαμπίτου ; Μ|άρκου

35. Δαμ[- -] κοσκ(ωνί?)ου ; ἐπὶ προφητῶν / [- -?]δρωνα κοσκου ; Ζήνωνος|τ(οῦ?) καὶ
Σατύρου ; γυμνασιάρχ(ου) ; υἱῶν

Fourth text: “(Place of) the gymnasiarch.”

Fifth: “(Place of) the sons(?)”

36. (Ξ)ενοφῶντος Κλαυδίας Βασσίλ|λης

“(Place of) Claudia Bassilla, the daughter of (the wife of?) Xenophon.”

37. τῶν περὶ Θεόδοτ|ον καὶ Θρασωνίδην ; Δηρίνου ; 'Ιουλίου

38. Λευκίου Σατορνείλου ἐπὶ 'Αρτέμ[ωνος] τὸ τρίκλεινον ; Σωπόλεως

39. 'Αρτέμωνος καὶ Λυσιμάχου τῶν Λυσιμάχ|ου ; ἀπὸ Μάρκο|υ / Χιόνιδος Ε[- -] ;
[- -]|ιονίδου φι[- -]

40. Φιλοστράτ{ος}ου Θ|έω[νος] / τοδ Χιόνιδος

41. ἐπὶ ['Αρισ? vel Στρα?]τονίκου

42. Σωφάνου / τρικλινλι ; ἐπὶ προφήτου|'Ανδρέου / vac.|Λυκείνου

43. ἐπὶ ΦΑ[- -] / 'Αντιπρά(τρου) ; ἐπὶ Φιλοστράτου / Δι[ο|νυσί[ο]υ καὶ Μενεσθέως
γ[- -?] ; Φω|ντίδου

44. ['Α]ριστομ[άρχου] ; Σωγέν[ους]

45. [Θ]εοδώρ[ου] καὶ Σω[γένους?] ὕμνωδ|ῶν διὰ Βίου

“(Place of) Thedorus and Sogenus(?), hymn-singers for life.”

46. Λαμπίτου

47. Λαμπίτου ; 'Ηρᾶ(ς?)

48. Λαμπίτου

49. Θευδᾶ | ς 50. Κτησίου Πausανίου / ἐπὶ Λευκίου ; ἐπὶ Χαύμου τῶν περὶ
Μενεκλέα

51. [Σ]υμμάχου ἐπὶ [- - -] ; [- - -] ΩΝ [- - -]

3. Row 3, seats numbered from east

1. Φλαβίου Διονυσιοδώρου / τρίκλ(ινον)

2. Ἄρτεμᾶ

3. ἐπὶ Μενίσ[κου]

4.a) [Θρ]άσωνος

b) vertical rise Ἄθηναι ; Δηρίνου

5.a) Μηνοφίλου ἐπὶ Ἄρίστωνος

b) vertical rise Ἄρίστω | [ν]ος δευ

6. Φιλίδου ; Ἄλκιδήμου

7. [- - -] ΕΣ [- - -] ; Δηρίνου

8. Λευκίου Μαλίου Σατορνίλου ἀπὸ Ἀρτέμωνος | προφήτου καὶ Γαίου Μαλίου Ῥηγίλ |
λου

9. Θέωνος ἐπὶ Σωφάνου | [- - -] ωιατων τοῦ ἀρχιερεῖος

“...of the high priest...”

10. Δηρίνου

11. Ἀπολλωνίου ὕμνωδοῦ / ἐπὶ Ῥούφου προφήτου

“(Reserved for) the hymn-singer Apollonius during the tenure of office of *prophetes* by Rufus.” Alternatively these could be two separate inscriptions: “(Place of?) the hymn-singer Apollonius” and “(Reserved) during the tenure of office of *prophetes* by Rufus.”

12. ἐπὶ Μιννίο[-]νος | Σωληνι(- - -)

L. Robert (1969, 661) suggests a restoration of σωληνι(στοῦ) or σωληνι(στοί), “shellfish-dealers”.

13.a) Δηρίνου

b) vertical face Ἡλιοδώρας ἀγωνο | θέτου ; Ἱεροκλέου

“(Place of) Heliodora the agonotheite.”

14.a) Λαμπίτου

b) Ἀλεξᾶ ὁ τόπος

The name Alexas is mentioned elsewhere (cf. 2.27b above) and in a context that casts some doubt on the translation of this text as “The place of Alexas.” A seat (2.27b) already appears

to be reserved for this individual, and although it might have been reserved at another time, he appears on several occasions. It is possible that in this case the name Alexas was preceded by an ἐπί that has been lost and the inscription is reserving a place for an individual whose name is missing during the tenure of office of *prophetes* by Alexas.

15. Μηνοφίλου τοῦ Μιννίωνος Rehm dates this inscription to the first decades C.E.

16. τῶν περὶ ΝΙΚΟΜΕΝΩΝ(- -?) 17. Λυσιμάχου

4. Row 3, numbered from west

1. Ἰασονος 2. [- -?] ἐμῶν τάδε Ζωσίμου 3. Φ(- -?) Ἀλκι(- -)

4. Ἀνδροκλέους / ἐπὶ Σωφάνου 5. ἐπὶ Λυκίνου Ἀρτεμῆ(ς?)

6. ἐπὶ Διογέλου ἄρχοντος Ἰουλίου ὁ τόπος καὶ προφήτου Ἀριστέου

This inscription is very complex, and may in fact be two inscriptions that have remained undistinguished. The first part of the text as it appears here, ἐπὶ Διογέλου, is a formula found on many other seats in the stadium and is perhaps best understood as “Reserved during the tenure of office of *prophetes* by Diogenus.” If ἄρχοντος Ἰουλίου is included here, then the text might read “Reserved for the archon Julius during the tenure of office of *prophetes* by Diogenus.” Although this might seem a logical place to suggest that the first inscription ends and the second begins, there are some difficulties here as well. The formula ὁ τόπος is found in four other inscriptions in the stadium (2.24, 2.27b, 2.5, 3.14b), but in all cases is preceded by a name, ostensibly the name of the person for whom the seat is reserved (although see 3.14b). If this pattern were to be followed here, then Julius would be associated with ὁ τόπος rather than with the office of archon. Another difficulty with dividing the inscription after the name Julius is that the second text would then read ὁ τόπος καὶ προφήτου Ἀριστέου, and the inclusion of the καὶ, as well as of the office of *prophetes* here, causes difficulty. All other mentions of the office of *prophetes* in the Didyma inscriptions are associated with the terms ἐπὶ or ἀπὸ and seem to be used to indicate that the seat was reserved while the individual named was *prophetes*. If the *prophetes* Aristeus is taken to be in the same inscription as ὁ τόπος, then the text could be interpreted as reserving a seat for him, an arrangement which appears unparalleled in the stadium (although cf. 2.27b). Rehm (102) suggests that the office of *stephanophorus* should be understood at the beginning of this inscription and that the text would therefore be dated to the particular year of the eponymous office with ἐπὶ, but again this does not seem to be paralleled elsewhere in the venue. Unfortunately it seems the only information that can be taken from this text is that a seat appears to have been reserved for an archon.

7. Ἡρᾶδος Δίου 8. ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ / Κικομήδου

9. Ἀριστέου

10. Νέων ; Ἀντιπλάτρου γυμνα(σιάρχου?)

“(Place of) the young men”; “(Place of) Antipater the gymnasiarch.”

5. Row 4

1. ἐπὶ Μενεκλέ- / ου / Χιονίδου καὶ Μιννίωνος / ἐπὶ Στράτωνος

2. Ἡροφῶντος

6. Row 4

1. Ποσιδωνίου προφήτου υἱοῦ Βοτίου

There are two possibilities for the interpretation of this inscription. The first is “(Place of) Posidonius, *prophetes*, son of Botius.” The name of the *prophetes*, Posidonius, is repeated elsewhere (1.5). When the title *prophetes* is mentioned in a seating inscription it is almost always in association with ἐπὶ and indicates that the seat was reserved during the tenure of that office by the individual named. The second possible translation of this text assumes that the ἐπὶ has been lost and therefore the inscription would read “(Reserved for) the son of Botius (during the tenure of office of) *prophetes* by Posidonius.”

2. Ἀσκληπιάδου καὶ Εὐφιλήτου ἱερῶν “(Place of) Asclepiadus and Euphiletus, priests.”

3. ἐπὶ Μινίωνος Νέωνος 4. Ἀχ(ε)ρδείων

7. Row 5

ἐπὶ Ἀτελ- / λίου / Καλουνά(---?) / [---]του

8. Block found *ex situ*

Block from the seats opposite the temple platform steps. This is the only inscription which survives from this area; most of the original seats have disappeared. Rehm 50a.

τῶν Ἱεροκωμητῶν “(Place of) the members of a sacred village association(?)”

69. Ephesus. Theatre seats. The theatre was originally constructed around 200 B.C.E. but was continually renovated until the end of 2nd c. C.E.; the *summa cavea* was added in 140-144 C.E. These texts are tentatively dated to 128 C.E. *SEG* 34.1168, a-d.

1. upper rise: [- - -] τῆς ᾽Ασίας lower rise: [- - -] Κεραμειτ[- - -]
2. upper rise: [- - -] ᾽Αριστοκράτο[υς]
3. upper rise: [- - - ν]αῶν τῶν ἐν Εφέσῳ Οὐλπίου lower rise: [- - -] τόπος ὁ δο[- - -]
4. upper rise: [- - -]μνηταῖς τόπ[ος - - -]

When combined in the correct order, the inscriptions read as following:

Upper rise: [Κερα]μῆταις τόπ[ος ὁ δοθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως] τῆς ᾽Ασίας [ν]αῶν τῶν ἐν ᾽Εφέσῳ Οὐλπίου ᾽Αριστοκράτο[υς]

Lower rise: Κεραμῆτ[αις] τόπος ὁ δο[θεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως] τῆς ᾽Ασίας ναῶν τῶν ἐν Εφέσῳ Οὐλπίου ᾽Αριστοκράτους]

“To individuals from Keramus, a place that was granted by Ulpius Aristocratus, the high priest of Asia of the temples in Ephesus.”

70. Ephesus. Theatre; see above no. 69. Perhaps related to seating. Various inscriptions from statues bases found in the theatre date to the 2nd c. and 3rd c. C.E. and the inscriptions below may date to the same period. *IK* 11.6, 2086a, b, c; Heberdey et al. 1912, no. 86a, b, c, 87a, b.

1. [κρ?]ατιστής Βο[υλης?]

“(Place of) the most illustrious (?) council.” The adjective κρατιστὸς is the Greek equivalent of *clarissimus*, the title accorded to those of senatorial rank.

- 2.a) [- - -?] γερο[σίας] “(Place of)...the council of elders.”

- b) [- - - βουλ?]άρχου στρα(τήγου) “(Place of) the *strategos*, leader of the council(?)”

3. [- - -?]Α[- - -] 4. [- - -?]ΩΙΓ(- - -) Ε[- - -] 5. ΤΟ[- - -]

71. *Miletus*. Theatre seats. The original theatre dates to the late 3rd c. B.C.E. but a complete reconstruction was begun in the Flavian era. The inscriptions are Roman in date. The *cunei* are identified from the left, the rows from the bottom, and the seating blocks from the right unless otherwise indicated. Herrmann 1998, 940a - aa.

Maenianum 1

1. *Cuneus* 1, row 2, blocks 1 and 2; 940a τόπος αὐραρίων Βενέτω(ν)

“Place of the Blue gold-workers.”

2. *Cuneus* 1, row 2, block 5; 940n ΗΓΑΝ(- -?) vel ‘Ηγ(- -)’ Αν(- -)

3. *Cuneus* 1, row 4, block 8; 940l; cf. 12.1. Σω[- -]

4. *Cuneus* 1, row 5, blocks 1 - 3; 940b τόπος αὐραρίω(ν) “Place of the gold-workers.”

5. *Cuneus* 1, row 8, block 8; 940n; cf. 14 ΗΓΑΝ

6. *Cuneus* 2, row 3, blocks 2 and 3; 940c τόπος ἐπινικίων / αὐραρίων

“Place of the triumphal gold-workers.”

7. *Cuneus* 2, row 3, blocks 5 and 6; 940h βενέτων Εἰο[υδ]έων

“(Place of) the Blue Jews.”

8. *Cuneus* 2 row 10, block 2 from left; 940o [- -]ΝΙΤ[- -]

9. *Cuneus* 2, row 14, block 7 from left; 940p [- -]ΑΣΙ[- -]

10. *Cuneus* 2, rows 17 - 19 (=1 - 3 from top). Row 1: block 1 from left; row 2: blocks 1 - 3 from left; row 3: blocks 1 - 5 from left. 940j.

θηλυ(μίτρου) / θηλυμίτρου / θηλυμίτρου

This text reserves approximately 20 seats in the theatre for the family and other dependents of Marcus Aurelius Thelymitres, a prominent athlete of the city (Herrmann, 126; van Nijf 1997, 223).

11. *Cuneus* 3, row 1, block 4; 940q ΠΑΙΤΟΣ
12. *Cuneus* 4, row 2, block 5; 940g Θε[οσ?]εβίων “(Place of) the God-fearers.”
13. *Cuneus* 4, row 3, block 1; 940i Διοδότου / τόπος “Place of Diodotus.”
14. *Cuneus* 4, rows 4-6. Row 6: block 2; row 5: blocks 1-3; row 4: blocks 1 and 2. 940d
τόπος φιλα- / γούστον / αὔραφίον “Place of the Emperor-loving gold-workers.”
15. *Cuneus* 4, row 5, block 4. Late 2nd - early 3rd c. CE. *SEG* IV 441; *CIJ* II 748; Hommel 1975; Trebilco 1991, 159-162; Herrmann 1998, 940f; Baker 2005
τόπος Εἰουδέων τῶν καὶ Θεο<σ>εβίων
“Place of the Jews who are of the group of God-fearers.”
16. *Cuneus* 4, row 16 (= row 4 from top), block 3; 940e τό(πος) νεωτέρων
“Place of the younger men.”
17. *Cuneus* 4, row 19 (= last), not in situ; 940r [τ]όπ[ος] “Place of...”
18. *Cuneus* 4, row 19 (=last), not in situ; 940s [- - -]ΥΡ[- - -]

Maenianum 2

19. *Cuneus* 6, row 2 (surviving) from top, block 1 from left; 940k ΜΑΡΞΙΣΛΗΞ

Blocks found ex situ

20. 940l Σωσιβίου ΣΩ is inscribed on a block lying to the southwest of the theatre, perhaps the beginning of Σωσιβίου.
21. 940m ‘Ρούφ[ου]
22. Found by the eastern entrance of the theatre; 940s [- - -]ΥΡ[- - -]
23. Found by the eastern entrance of the theatre; 940y [- - -]λαγέω[v - - -]
24. Found by the eastern entrance to the theatre; 940z [- - -]ΝΙΟ[- - -]

25. Found by the baths; 940t [- - -]BEP[- - -]
26. Found northwest of the theatre; 940u [- - -]NEIK[- - -]
27. Found southwest of the theatre; 940v [- - -]ΦΙΣΑ[- - -]
28. Found southwest of the theatre; 940w [- - -]ΡΟΣΠ[- - -]
29. Found southwest of the theatre; 940x [- - -]BA[- - -]
30. 940aa [- - -]λιον[- - -]

72. Smyrna. Theatre seat. The theatre was originally constructed at the end of the 2nd c. B.C.E. and the extant theatre was built no later than the 2nd c. C.E. This inscription was identified as coming from a seat by Sear (2006, 3, 353); its date is unknown. Le Bas and Waddington 1972, no. 10.

Ἰουλίου

Lydia

73. Saittai. Stadium seats. The inscriptions date to the second half of the 2nd c. to the 3rd c. C.E. The *cunei* are identified from left beginning in the northeastern end of the stadium, and rows are identified from the bottom unless otherwise indicated. Kolb 1990, nos. 1-40, listed in the same order here; also *TAM* V 74; van Nijf 1997, 232-233.

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1. <i>Cuneus</i> 2 row 10 | φυλῆς Ἀπολλωνιάδος | “(Place of) the tribe <i>Apollonias</i> .” |
| 2. <i>Cuneus</i> 2 row 10 | [Ἀπ]ολλω[νιάδος] | “(Place of the tribe) <i>Apollonias</i> .” |
| 3. <i>Cuneus</i> 2 row 11 | φ[υ]λῆς [Ἀπ]ο[λ]λωνιάδος | “(Place of) the tribe <i>Apollonias</i> .” |
| 4. <i>Cuneus</i> 3 row 2 | Διονυσιάδος | “(Place of the tribe) <i>Dionysias</i> .” |
| 5. <i>Cuneus</i> 3 row 3 | [φυλῆς Ἀσκληπιά?]δος | “(Place of the tribe) <i>Asclepias</i> .” |
| 6. <i>Cuneus</i> 3 row 6 | φυ(λῆς) Διονυσιάδος | “(Place of) the tribe <i>Dionysias</i> .” |

7. *Cuneus* 3 row 7 φυ{λῆς) ᾿Ασκληπιάδος “(Place of) the tribe *Asclepias*.”
8. *Cuneus* 3 row 8 φ(υλῆς) Διονυσιά[δος] “(Place of) the tribe *Dionysias*.”
9. *Cuneus* 3 row 9 φ[υλῆς ᾿Α]σ[κληπιάδος?] “(Place of) the tribe *Asclepias*(?).”
10. *Cuneus* 3 row 12 ᾿Ασκ{η}ληπιάδ[ος] “(Place of the tribe) *Asclepias*.”
11. *Cuneus* 4 row 1, block 1 from left ΣΙ(---)
12. *Cuneus* 4 row 6 γερου[σίας] “(Place of) the council of elders.”
13. *Cuneus* 4 row 9 Σαταληνῶν “(Place of the tribe) of the *Satalenoi*.”
14. *Cuneus* 4 row 10 Σαταληνῶ[v] “(Place of the tribe) of the *Satalenoi*.”
15. *Cuneus* 4 row 11 φ(υλῆς) Σαταληνῶν “(Place of) the tribe of the *Satalenoi*.”

This tribe appears to have been named after the village of Satala which was located within the territory of Saittai; cf. nos. 13. and 14.

16. *Cuneus* 4 row 12 Τομασαιτηνῶ[v] “(Place of) the tribe of the *Tamasaitenoi*.”

This tribe appears to have been named after the village of Tamasis which was located within the territory of Saittai.

17. *Cuneus* 5 row 1 ἱερ[έως?] vel ἱερ[έων?] “...of the priest(?) or priests(?)”
18. *Cuneus* 5 row 2 νεδε[---] 19. *Cuneus* 5 row 3 EEP
20. *Cuneus* 5 row 4 [- - -]νῶν ? 21. *Cuneus* 5 row 5 [- -]δη[- - -]
22. *Cuneus* 5 row 6 οὔγο[- - -]
23. *Cuneus* 6 row 4, almost in the centre Ο(---)
24. *Cuneus* 6 row 5, nearly at the end of the row Υ(---)
25. *Cuneus* 6 row 6 φ(υλῆς ?) Συν[---]ηίδος “(Place of) the tribe...”

26. *Cuneus* 6 row 9 [- - -]εσι[- - -] 27. *Cuneus* 7 row 4 Ψ[-]NA(- - -?)
28. *Cuneus* 7 row 5 Λ(- - -)
29. *Cuneus* 7 row 13 τό[πος ? - - -] “Place of...”
30. *Cuneus* 8 row 1 [- - - λ]ινο[υργῶν] “(Place of the tribe) of the linen-workers.”
31. *Cuneus* 8 row 2 [- - - λιν]ουργῶν “(Place of the tribe) of the linen-workers.”
32. *Cuneus* 8 row 3 [- - - λινο]υ[ρ]γῶν “(Place of the tribe) of the linen-workers.”
33. *Cuneus* 8 row 5 [- - -]γῶν “(Place of the tribe) of the linen-workers(?)”
34. *Cuneus* 8 row 6 [- - -]ρ{α}γῶ[ν ?] νε[ωτέρων ?]

“(Place of the tribe) of the younger linen-workers(?)”

35. *Cuneus* 8 row 7 φυλ(ῆς) Β' [λ]ινο[υργῶν ?]

“(Place of) the tribe of the linen-workers (2).” The number two may indicate the order of this tribe in the official list. This is the only tribe in Saittai with a surviving inscription named after a professional association; cf. nos. 30-34 and **80.11+18** from Gerasa.

36. *Cuneus* 8 row 8 φ(υλῆς) Ἡερακ(ληίδος) [- - -]ευαρδοος ν(- - -?)

“(Place of) the tribe *Heracleas*...”

37. *Cuneus* 8 row 9 φ(υλῆς) Ἡρα(κληίδος) φ(υλῆς) Λ[- - -]α[- ί]δος

“(Place of) the tribe *Heracleas*; (Place of) the tribe...”

38. *Cuneus* 8 row 10 φ(υλῆς) Ἡρα(κληίδος) φ(υλῆς) [- - -]ιδ]ο[ς]

“(Place of) the tribe *Heracleas*; (Place of) the tribe...”

39. *Cuneus* 8 row 11 Ἡρα[κληίδος] φ(υλῆς) Λ[- - -]α[ιδ]ο[ς]

“(Place of the tribe) *Heracleas*(?); (Place of) the tribe...”

40. *Cuneus* 8 row 12 [Ἡρ]α[κληί]δ[ος]? φ(υλῆς)

“(Place of the tribe) *Heracleas*(?); (Place of) the tribe...”

41. *Cuneus* 8 row 13 φ(υλῆς) Ἡρακ(ληίδος) φ(υλῆς) [- - -]

“(Place of the tribe) *Heracleas*; (Place of) the tribe...”

Mysia

74. Pergamum. Theatre seats. The first permanent stone building dates to the late 3rd c. B.C.E.; renovations were carried out under the Romans. At least two of these inscriptions are Roman in date (nos. 3 and 6); the others may be as well. Rows are identified from the bottom of the theatre. Fabricius and Schuchhardt 1902, no. 616 a-g, 617-19; listed in same order here except no. 4(=e) and no. 5 (=d).

1. Upper *maenianum*, in the south of the theatre, row 17, directly beside middle stairway.

διακατέχεται [ὑπὸ - - -] “Reserved for...”

2. Upper *maenianum*, in the north of the theatre, rows 22-24, directly beside middle stairway.

διακατέχεται - - - / δια[κατ]έχεται [- - -] / [διακατέχεται] ὑπὸ Ἀριστείδου

“Reserved...Reserved...Reserved for Aristeides.” Fabricius and Schuchhardt (385) suggest that all three rows were assigned to Aristeides and members of his family. This would be quite a large number of seats and it seems unlikely that Aristeides and his family would have been able to fill them all. It is possible that others were allowed to sit there as well, including, for example, individuals involved in a group of which he was a patron.

3. Upper *maenianum*, rows 21-23, 5 metres south of the middle steps; most of the seats are destroyed.

[- - -] / [- - -] ρ' Ἰουλίου Κιθάρδ[ου? - - -] / [- - -]

4. Upper *maenianum*, row 23, lying loose. [διακατέχεται ὑπὸ?] Γαβ[ινίου?]

5. Found in lower part of theatre. [διακατέχεται ὑπὸ Ἀττ?]όλου

6. [δι]ακατέχεται / [ὑπὸ] Κλαυδίου Λο / [---]ε[---]έθους “Reserved for Claudius...”

7. δια[κατέχεται ὑπὸ ---] 8. Χάρις

9. Τόπος [---] “Place of...” 10. [---]ων τόπος “Place of...”

Phrygia

75. Hierapolis. Theatre seats. The theatre was begun in the late 1st c. C.E. and finished under Hadrian; the inscriptions date to the late 2nd - early 3rd c. C.E. The *cunei* are identified from left, rows are identified from the bottom, and the seating blocks from the left unless otherwise indicated. Kolb 1974, nos. 1-10; listed in the same order here.

1. *Cuneus* 2 row 13, blocks 1, 2 φυλῆς Εὐμεν[ίδος]

“(Place of) the tribe *Eumenis*.” This tribe was most likely named after Eumenes I.

2. *Cuneus* 3 row 11, block 1 φυ[λ]ῆς Σελευ[κίδος]

“(Place of) the tribe *Seleucis*.” This tribe was named after Seleucus I.

3. *Cuneus* 3 row 13, blocks 1, 2 [φ]υλῆς [Λα]οδ[ικίδ]ος

“(Place of) the tribe *Laodicis*.” This tribe was most likely named after the mother of Seleucus I.

4. *Cuneus* 4 row 11, block 1 φυλ[ῆς] Ἀτ[τ]αλίδος

“(Place of) the tribe *Attalis*.”

5. *Cuneus* 4 row 13, blocks 1, 2 φυλῆς [---]να[-]ολ[---] “(Place of) the tribe...”

6. *Cuneus* 5 (the middle *cuneus*), 2 rows behind the box of honour, blocks 1 and 2

πρώ(της) [φυλῆς Ἀπο]λλωνιάδος “(Place of) the first tribe *Apollonias*.”

7. *Cuneus* 5 (the middle *cuneus*), row 21 (row 3 from top), blocks 1 and 2

Πρώ(της) φυλῆς Ἀπολλωνιάδος “(Place of) the first tribe *Apollonias*.”

Nos. 6 and 7 are the only texts not found in rows 11 or 13 of the theatre.

8. *Cuneus* 6 row 11, blocks 1 - 3 [φ]υλῆς [- 7-8 -]ικίδ[ος]

A possible expansion is [φ]υλῆς [Στρατον]ικίδ[ος], “(Place of) the tribe *Stratonikis*.”

9. *Cuneus* 8 row 11, block 1 φυλῆς Σειλα[- -] “(Place of) the tribe...”

10. *Cuneus* 9 row 13, blocks 1 - 3 φυλῆς [Ἀντι]οχίδος “(Place of) the tribe *Antiochis*.”

76. *Laodicea*. Larger theatre, inscription on seats. The *cavea* is thought to date to the Hellenistic period, but the outside *cunei* and the stage building are most likely Roman. The inscription covers five seats in the third row from the back of the theatre. *MAMA* 6, no. 7; *AE* 1940, 179.

Παυλείνου ὑποτικοῦ “(Place of) Paulinus, man of consular rank.”

This inscription could perhaps be reserving a seat for Tiberius Claudius Paulinus, who was a suffect consul at an unknown date before 184 C.E. (*AE* 1940, 179).

Pisidia

77. *Termessus*. Theatre seats. The theatre originally dates to Hellenistic period but the upper *maenianum* was added under Augustus and the south end of the *cavea* was extended in the late 2nd c. C.E.; here the entries are divided by *maenianum* to emphasize the different dates of construction. The *cunei* are numbered from south to north, the rows from bottom to top, and the blocks from the left unless otherwise indicated. The vertical lines denote the divisions between seating blocks. *TAM* 3.1 872.

Upper *maenianum*

1. *Cuneus* 2. Seats not *in situ*

1. Προκα|τέχεται - - - “Reserved...” 2. [- - -]ς Ἀλ|εξάνδ|ρου - - - ?

3. [- - -]|γυναικός? Ἑρεσίου “...(place of) the wife(?) of Heresius.”

4. [‘ αμ?]αχίου Φι | λίππου 5. [Δ] | αιδόλ | [ου --- ?] 6. | ΠΙΕΡΝ |
7. | ΠΑΥΑ | 8. | ΚΟ[-]ΝΑΛ | 9. | ΝΟ |

2. Cuneus 3

1. Row 1, blocks 2 and 3 from right |’ Ιερόνει | κοι |

“The sacred victors.” The inscription is bracketed by palm leaves.

2. Row 3, blocks 4 and 5 from right | Σ | ΩΜΟΛ |
3. Row 5, entire row | λοητ | ου | [- - -] | [-] ο [-] ο | ς καὶ Ο | ραμβλ | ητος |
4. Row 6, blocks 1 and 2 from right |’ Ερμαίσ | κου Α |

R. Heberdey, the editor of the relevant volume of *TAM*, suggests that nos. 3 and 4 should be joined and provides τόπος as a suggestion to fill in the missing letters. |’ Ερμαίσ | κου Α | λοητ | ου | [ό | τ] [ό | π] ο | ς καὶ Ο | ραμβλ | ητος | “(Place of) Hermaiscus Aloetus and Orambletus(?)”:

5. Row 7, blocks 4 and 5 from right | Σωα | κλου | [- - - ?]

What appears to be a palm leaf follows the text, indicating that the individual in question is a victor in sacred games.

6. Row 8, block 1 from right Πριω(- - - ?)

3. Cuneus 4

1. Row 1, blocks 7-8 | Κοδνου | νδιος |
2. Row 1, blocks 1-4 | ΦΩ | ΕΙΡ | Λ[- - -] | [- - -]
3. Row 2, blocks 1-3 | [Θαλ] | λ | [ε] λ αίου | vel | [Θα] | λ | [ε] λ αίου |
4. Row 3, blocks 4-5 | Οϋλ | ου
5. Row 3, blocks 1-3 | [- - -] | ++Ο | Σ |

6. Row 4, blocks 1-3 |' Αβ[σ]| καν | το | ζ |
7. Row 5, blocks 8-10 | Κο | δνο | υνδιος | 8. Row 5, block 7 | ΟΣ |
9. Row 5, blocks 2-6 | τόπ | [ος] ' Α | νύτα | γ' Αϊνέ | ου |

“Place of Anuta and Aineus.”

10. Row 5, blocks 1-3 | [Τ]ιβ(ερίού) ' Ερ | ω | τος |
11. Row 6, blocks 7 and 8 | [-]Κ[-] | Τ[-]ΟΝ+
12. Row 6, blocks 4 and 5 | Ο [- - -?] | Α [- - -?] |
13. Row 6, block 3 | Διοτείμου | 14. Row 6, blocks 1 and 2 | Ν | Ο |
15. Row 7, blocks 5 and 6 | +Κόν | ων[-?] | Οπλ | ωνος |
16. Row 7, blocks 3 and 4 | Αρμαστα / Μελησάνδρ | ο[υ]
17. Row 7, blocks 1 and 2 | Σ | Ο |
18. Row 8, blocks 6-9 | Κατ | έχ | [ετ]αι | ' Αμα | [ζονίδ(?)] | ι | Κόν | ων[ο | υ]

“Reserved for Amazonid[- -]I Kononus.” Heberdey suggests that the inclusion of Κόνων... here is an alternative to including it in no. 15 above.

19. Row 8, blocks 4 and 5 | Προκ | λέους |
20. Row 8, block 3 | Μελησάδρο[υ] |
21. Row 8, blocks 1 and 2 | ΠΟ[-] | ΠΟ[-] |
22. Row 9, block 3? | Προκατέχε | τε Αρμασ[τα] |

Heberdey joins nos. 16, 20, and 22, all aligned vertically: | Προκατέχε | τε Αρμασ[τα] | | Μελησάνδρο[υ] | | Αρμαστα / Μελησάνδρ | ο[υ]. “Reserve for Armasta, the daughter of (the wife of?), Melesandrus, Armasta, the daughter of (the wife of?), Melesandrus.”

4. *Cuneus* 5; only a portion of this *cuneus* survives and the rows are numbered relatively

1. Row 1, blocks 1 and 2 |Υ Οβρι |μοτου |
2. Row 3, blocks 1-3 |'Α |ρχε[λ]|ας |
3. Row 3, blocks 1 and 2 |Υ γ [πρυ]τά |νει [- - -] | "...the *prytanis*(?)..."
4. Row 4, blocks 1 and 2 |Κοντα |Π[- - -]Ε Γ |

5. *Cuneus* 6 |Τ |Ο | [πος?] "Place of..."6. *Cuneus* 7

1. Row 1, block 7 |Β[-?]
2. Rows 5-1. Row 5, blocks 2-5; Rows 4, blocks 2 and 3; Rows 3, blocks 2 and 3; Row 2, blocks 2 and 3; Row 1, blocks 3 and 4

|Κα |τέ | [χ |ετ]|α |ι |' υπό ὄρ |χ|ι ||ερε |ας ||[Μα]|μασ |τι |δος Μ |

"Reserved for the high priestess..." Heberdey supplies Μομοτασιος β' as additional text to finish the line, joining no. 1 above to this inscription, although the text he supplies is not visible in the diagram in *TAM*. The first portion of the inscription, in row 5, has been inscribed over an earlier text which is difficult to decipher. Blocks 6 and 7 of row 5 contain the letters AMO, but they do not seem to be part of the longer inscription. The lower rows also seem in some cases to have been inscribed over earlier texts.

3. Row 6, blocks 3 and 4 ||[- - -] | [-]Ε+[-]
4. Row 6, block 2 |Καυαλης | 5. Row 8, blocks 1-3 |ΠΠ | vac. | Α++Ι

7. *Cuneus* 8

1. Row 1, blocks 1-3 from right | [- - -] | [- -] λωγ |βασιος |
2. Row 1, blocks 1-3 from left |Λιβα |ορτ |ου
3. Row 5, blocks 1-5 from right | [- - -] ου το |ϛ |Λιβ |αο |ρτου |

This text is inscribed over an earlier one which Heberdey identifies as: | [Κατέχε]τε | υπό Να | νν[η]λ | ιδος vel Να | νν[η]λης | Η]λ | ιδος, "Reserve for Nannelis *or* Reserve for

Nannela Helios.”

4. Row 6, blocks 1-4 from right, not in *TAM* |[- - -]|IE|[- - -]|KAI|[- - -]|

5. Row 8, blocks 2-6 from right |Προκ|ατέχ|εται|ύπο|[- - -]|[- - -]|

“Reserved for...”

6. Row 8, blocks 6 and 7 from right |[τ]όπο[ς]| “Place of...”

8. *Cuneus* 9; only a portion of this *cuneus* survives and the rows are numbered relatively

1. Row 1, entire row

|Ορ(ρεων)|λα(τύπων)|vac.|Ορρε(ων)|λα(τύπων)|Ορ(ρεων)|λα(τύπων)|Ορρεων|λα|
τύπω|ν|vac.|vac.|vac.|Ορ(ρεων)|λα(τύπων)|

van Nijf (1997, 225) suggests that rather than ὀρρεῶν λατύποι, the stone-cutters associated with the imperial *horrea*, this inscription could refer to ορείοι λατύποι, the stone-cutters from the mountains.

2. Row 2, blocks 3-7 |[Κα|τέ|χ?]|ε|τε|ύπο|[- - -]| “Reserve for...”

3. Row 2, blocks 1 and 2 |Δημ|+T|[- - -]|

4. Row 3, blocks 4 and 6, not numbered in *TAM* |[- - -]|Σ| |N|[- - -]|

5. Row 3, blocks 1 and 2 |Δη|μος+|

6. Row 4, blocks 7-10 |[- - -]|E|TEYT+|[- - -]|+[- - -]|N|

9. *Cuneus* 10; only a portion of this *cuneus* survives and the rows are numbered relatively

1. Row 1, block 4 |Λ+|

2. Row 3, blocks 2-6 |[- - -]|OYT|OKAI|OPT|[- - -]|A|[- - -]|M|

3. Row 4, blocks 1-4 |[Δ]η|μο|[κ]λε|ων|

10. *Cuneus* 11, row 3, blocks 1 and 2 |Ω|N|

Lower *maenianum*11. *Cuneus* 1

1. Row 2 from top Προκατέχεται / ὑπὸ Ζηνοδό[του?] “Reserved for Zenodotus(?)”

12. *Cuneus* 2

1. Row 1, block 1 from left | O |
2. Row 7, blocks 1-3 from right | ΘΕΡ | ΠΛΑ | ΤΩ[- - -] |
3. Row 8, blocks 1-3 from left | Γ | Ν | Α |
4. Row 8, blocks 2 and 3 from right | [- - -] ΜΩ | ΝΕΛΕ |
5. Row 9, blocks 1 and 2 from left | ΓΝ | Α |
6. Row 10, blocks 1 and 2 from left | ΓΝ | Α |
7. Row 11, block 1 from left | ΓΥΝ |
8. Row 11, blocks 1 and 2 from right | [- - -] Ε | ΩΝ |
9. Row 12, block 1 from left | ΓΝΑ |
10. Row 12, block 1 from right | ΛΕ |
11. Row 13, blocks 1 and 2 from right | Ω | Ν |
12. Row 14, blocks 1 and 2 from right | Ω | Ν |
13. Row 15, blocks 1 and 2 from right | Ε+ | Α |
14. Row 16, blocks 1-3 from right | ΟΠ | Λ | Ο |
15. Row 18, blocks 12-15 | Κατεχ[έ?] | [ται? - - -] | [- - -] | [- - -] Η | “Reserved...”
16. Row 18, blocks 9-11 | ‘ Ρητορικοῦ | + | ΠΙΤ+Υ | “(Place of?) the rhetor...”

17. Row 18, block 5 | ΕΠ |
18. Row 18, blocks 5-8 | ΚΑ | ΤΑΓ | ΕΙΧΑ | Α |
19. Row 18, block 5 | [Α] ὕρ(ηλια?) Αρμασ[τα] |

13. *Cuneus* 3; only a portion of this *cuneus* survives ; the rows are numbered relatively

1. Row 1, blocks 1-3 Α | ΜΑΧ | Α |
2. Row 2, unknown blocks | Ν | Α
3. Row 2, block 1 | ΧΡ |
4. Row 3, blocks 1-3 | Ἐφ | ηβ | ω | [ν ---] “(Place of) the ephebes...”
5. Row 4, blocks 1-4 | Ἐφ | η | β | ω | [ν ---] “(Place of) the ephebes...”
6. Row 5, blocks 1-6 | Ἐφ | ηβ | ων Α | ὕτ[ο] | μεν | ι[ανῶν? ---]

“(Place of) the *Automenianoι* (?) ephebes...”

7. Row 6, blocks 1-3 | δὲζ' Α | ρτειμο | υ |
8. Row 7, blocks 1-3 | Ἐρμ | αι | ου |

Heberdey joins the above two inscriptions: | Ἐρμ | αι | ου || δὲζ' Α | ρτειμο | υ |
 “(The place of) Hermaius; the second spot(?) of Arteimus?” or “(The place of) Hermaius
 the son of Hermaius, Arteimus?”

9. Row 8, blocks 1-5 | Ἡλιοφο | ρια | ν | ω | ν |
10. Row 9, blocks 3 and 4 | Ἐφ | η | βων |

Heberdey joins the above two inscriptions: | Ἐφ | η | βων || Ἡλιοφο | ρια | ν | ω | ν |
 “(Place of) the ephebes *Heliophorianoι*(?).”

Palaestina

78. Nablus/Schechem (*Flavia Neapolis*). Theatre seats. The theatre may have been constructed around the time of Marcus Aurelius. This inscription is located in the first row of the central *cuneus*. Magen 1984, 275.

φψλ(ῆς) Ἡρακλῆιδος “(Place of) the tribe *Heracleis*.”

In the area which this inscription denotes are carved in Greek letters the numbers 1 through 21, moving from right to left. Since the entire tribe could not have fit in these seats it seems that they were instead for chosen representatives. The rest of the tribe may have occupied a portion, or the entirety, of the rest of the central *cuneus*. To the west of this text are two more reserving seats for tribes but they are only very fragmentary (Magen, 275).

Arabia

79. Bostra / Nova Traiana Bostra. Theatre seats. The theatre is Trajanic in date. All the inscriptions are identified as being in irregular script. The *cunei* are numbered from the right. *IGLSyr* XIII, 9156-9166; cf. van Nijf 1997, 228 no. 5.

1. *Cuneus* 1, *praecinctio* 1, 1st seat of honour from right; 9166 [- - -]OY[- - -]
2. *Cuneus* 1, *praecinctio* 1, 2nd seat of honour from right; 9165 [- - -]KAA[- - -]
3. *Cuneus* 1, *praecinctio* 1, 19th seat of honour; 9157 [- - -]K[- - -]
4. *Cuneus* 2 row 9, seats 6-10; 9156 Χαλκατόποι vel Χαλκα(τύπων) τόποι

“The bronze-workers *or* The places of the bronze-workers.” The first suggestion necessitates seeing Χαλκατόποι as the equivalent of Χαλκοτύποι, and provides a nominative plural form. The second suggestion provides the genitive plural of the variant plus τόποι.

5. *Cuneus* 2 row 11, seats 11 and 12 from right; 9159 Ἄσκ(οποιῶν)

“(Place of) the wine-skin makers.”

6. *Cuneus* 2, *praecinctio* 1, 2nd seat of honour from right; 9163 [- - -]Y[- - -]

7. *Cuneus* 2, *praecinctio* 1, 3rd seat of honour from right; 9162 Χρυσο[χόων]

“(Place of) the gold-workers.”

8. *Cuneus* 2, *praecinctio* 1, 5th seat of honour from right; 9164 ΚΑΛ[- -]

9. *Cuneus* 2, *praecinctio* 1, 6th seat of honour from right; 9160 ᾽Ασκ(οποιῶν)

“(Place of) the wine-skin makers.”

10. *Cuneus* 2, *praecinctio* 1, 7th seat of honour from right; 9161 Χρυσο[χόων]

“(Place of) the gold-workers.”

11. On a seat of honour installed in the 2nd *praecinctio*, slightly to the right of the centre; the inscription is unfinished and would have been continued on the next seat; 9158.

᾽Ασκοπ[οιῶν] “(Place of) the wine-skin makers.”

80. Gerasa (Jerash). Odeon (also known as the North Theatre), podium and seat inscriptions. The original phase of construction dates to 165/166 C.E., and a later architectural phase to the reign of Severus Alexander (222-235 C.E.). The original tribal inscriptions as well as that for the βουλῇ seem to date to the second century, whereas that for the λιγούργοι is of a later date. The *cunei* are identified from the left facing the *cavea*; the rows are identified from the bottom. The Greek numeral associated with each tribe represents its number in the order of the tribes as they were seated in the odeon. The reference to Agusta-Boularot and Seigne 2004, nos. 4 to 28, is provided first followed by that to Retzleff and Mjely 2004, nos. 1.1-4.11. If only one reference is given it is to Agusta-Boularot and Seigne 2004 unless otherwise indicated. The text of the inscriptions from Retzleff and Mjely have been provided in the case of a disagreement with those from Agusta-Boularot and Seigne.

1. *Cuneus* 1, podium. no. 4; no. 1.1 Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: Τόπο[ς] Βουλῆς
Retzleff and Mjely: Τό[πο]ς [Β]ουλῆς
“(Place of) the council.”

2. *Cuneus* 2, podium. no. 12; nos. 2.10 and 2.11 Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: δ' Ἀφροδίτης
Retzleff and Mjely: δ' Ἀφροδί[της]
“(Place of the tribe) of Aphrodite (4).”

3. *Cuneus* 2, row 2. no. 11; nos. 2.8 and 2.9 δ' φυλ(ῆς) Ἀφροδίτης
 “(Place of) the tribe of Aphrodite.”
4. *Cuneus* 2, row 4, far left. no. 10; no. 2.7 γ' “... (3).”
5. *Cuneus* 2, row 6. no. 9; nos. 2.5 and 2.6 Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: γ' φυλ(ῆς) Λητοῦς
 Retzleff and Mjely: γ' φυλ(ῆς) Λήτου
 “(Place of) the tribe of Leto (3).”
6. *Cuneus* 2, row 8, far left. no. 8; no. 2.4 β' “... (2).”
7. *Cuneus* 2, row 10. no. 7; no. 2.3 Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: β' φυλ(ῆς) Ἀπόλλωνος
 Retzleff and Mjely: φυλ(ῆς) Ἀπόλλων[ος]
 “(Place of) the tribe of Apollo (2).”
8. *Cuneus* 2, row 12. no. 6; nos. 2.1 and 2.2 α' φυλ(ῆς) Διός
 “(Place of) the tribe of Zeus (1).”
9. *Cuneus* 2, back wall. no. 5 α' φ[υλ]ῆς Διός “(Place of) the tribe of Zeus (1).”
10. *Cuneus* 3, podium, far left. no. 19; nos. 3.6 and 3.7
 η' Ἀδ[ριονῆς] “(Place of the tribe) *Hadriane* (8).”
11. *Cuneus* 3, podium. no. 28 λινουργῶν (ὁ τόπος) “(Place of) the linen-workers.”
12. *Cuneus* 3, row 4. no. 18; no. 3.5
 Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: η' φ[υλ(ῆς)] Ἀδριον[ῆς] Ἡ[λ]ίου
 Retzleff and Mjely: φυλ(ῆς) Ἀδρια[ν]ῆς
 “(Place of) the tribe *Hadriane* (*Helios*) (8).”
13. *Cuneus* 3, row 6, far left. no. 17 ζ' “... (7).”

14. *Cuneus* 3, row 7. no. 16; nos. 3.3 and 3.4

Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: ζ' φυλ(ῆς) 'Αθην[ᾶ]ς
 Retzleff and Mjely: ζ' φυλ(ῆς) 'Α[θη]ν[ᾶ]ς

“(Place of) the tribe of Athena (7).”

15. *Cuneus* 3, row 9, far left. no. 15 ζ' “...(6).”

16. *Cuneus* 3, row 11. no. 14; no. 3.2 Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: ζ' φυλ(ῆς) 'Ηρακλέου[ς]
 Retzleff and Mjely: φυλ(ῆς) 'Ηρακλ[έου]ς
 “(Place of) the tribe of Hercules (6).”

17. *Cuneus* 3, row 13. no. 13; no 3.1 Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: ε' φυλ(ῆς) 'Αρτέμιδος
 Retzleff and Mjely: φυλ(ῆς) 'Αρ[τέ]μιδ[ο]ς
 “(Place of) the tribe of Artemis (5).”

18. *Cuneus* 4, podium. no. 27 ὁ τόπος “Place of...”

Retzleff and Mjely combine this entry and no. 11. to form their catalogue number 4.11;
 Agusta-Boularot and Seigne make the same suggestion:

Λινουργῶν ὁ τόπος “Place of the linen-workers.”

19. *Cuneus* 4, row 2. no. 26; nos. 4.9 and 4.10

ιβ' φυλ(ῆς) "Ηρας “(Place of) the tribe of Hera (12).”

20. *Cuneus* 4, row 6, far left. no. 25; no. 4.8 ια' “...(11).”

Agusta-Boularot and Seigne indicate that this inscription is in row 6, whereas Retzleff and Mjely indicate that it is located in row 5.

21. *Cuneus* 4, row 7. no. 24; nos. 4.6 and 4.7

Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: ια' φυλ(ῆς) 'Ασκληπιοῦ
 Retzleff and Mjely: ια' φυλ(ῆς) [Ασ]κληπιοῦ
 “(Place of) the tribe of Asclepius (11).”

22. *Cuneus* 4, row 9, far left. no. 23; nos. 4.4 and 4.5

Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: ι' "... (10)."

Retzleff and Mjely: ι' φυλ(ῆς) Δημήτρος

"(Place of) the tribe of Demeter (10)."

23. *Cuneus* 4, row 11. no. 22; no. 4.3

Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: ι' φυλ(ῆς) Δημήτρος

"(Place of) the tribe of Demeter (10)."

Retzleff and Mjely: ι' "... (10)."

24. *Cuneus* 4, row 13. no. 21; nos. 4.1 and 4.2

Agusta-Boularot and Seigne: θ' φυλ(ῆς) Π[οσ]ειδῶνος

Retzleff and Mjely: θ' φυλ(ῆς) Π[οσειδ]ωνο[ς]

"(Place of) the tribe of Poseidon (9)."

25. *Cuneus* 4, back wall. no. 20 θ' φυ[λ]ῆς [Π]οσ[ειδ]ῶνο[ς]

"(Place of) the tribe of Poseidon (9)."

Egypt

81. Alexandria. Theatre seats. The theatre is Severan in date. The seating blocks are identified from the left facing the *cavea*. Borkowski 1981.

1. Row 1, seating block 4; 81 no. 39

Νικᾷ ἡ τύχ- / η Καλοτύχο- / υ καὶ τοῦ νέ- / ου Δόρου / Νικᾷ ἡ τύχη / Πρασίνω[ν]
γεννέωτα- / των / ᾽Απὸ κόρου- / φῆς ὡς ὁ- / νύχων / ἔπεσεν / τὸ Βένετο / καὶ ΗΧ[-
|Σ[-] / ΜΕΤ[-]ΤΩΝ

"The fortune triumphs of Kalotuchus and the young Dorus! The fortune triumphs of the most noble Greens! The Blue was defeated from his head to his feet (?)." The translation of the last legible clause is a suggestion of Borkowski (1981, 60-61).

2. Row 2, seating block 5; 87 no. 47.

Νικᾷ ἡ τύχη / Εὐτοκίου / κὲ Βενέτων / κακὰ τὰ ἔτη / τοῦ Λαχανᾷ

“The fortune triumphs of Eutokius and the Blues! Bad years for Lachanas!” This is the only inscription for the Blues that survives in the Alexandrian theatre.

3. Row 5, seating block 3; 86 no. 24 Νικᾷ ἡ τύχη / τῶν <ν>έων πρ- / ασίνων

“The fortune triumphs of the Green young men!”

4. Row 5, seating block 3; 80 no. 25

Νικᾷ ἡ τύ- / χη Καλο- / τύχου / κὲ ᾿Αε- / τοῦ / κὲ τοῦ / Δόρου

“The fortune triumphs of Kalotuchus and Aetus and Dorus!” These charioteers rode for the Greens.

5. Row 7, seating block 3; 80 no. 18

Νικᾷ ἡ τύχη / Πετομένου / κέ ᾿Αετοῦ / κε τοῦ / Δόρου / ΚΕ[- -]Ω / ΙΚΑΗΚΑ / ΤΟV+

“The fortune triumphs of Petomenus and Aetus and Dorus!...”, Green charioteers.

6. Row 11, seating block 1; 96 no. 15

PNB

These letters have a numerical value of 152 and may indicate that rows 1 through 11 were somehow distinct from rows 12 and above which were numbered in a different manner.

Bibliography

- Abbott, F.F. and A.C. Johnson. 1926. *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*. Princeton.
- Agusta-Boularot, S et J. Seigne. 2004. "La vie civique de Gerasa de la décapole: l'apport des inscriptions du "theatre" nord de Jerash (Jordanie)." *MEFRA* 116.1: 481-569.
- Alföldy, G. 1985. *The Social History of Rome*. Translated by D. Braund and F. Pollock. Totowa.
- , 1975. *Die Römischen Inschriften von Tarraco*. Berlin.
- Alcock, S.E. 1997. "Greece: a landscape of resistance?" in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism. Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*. [JRA Supplementary Series no. 23] . D.J. Mattingly, ed. 103-115. Portsmouth.
- Alicu, D. and C. Opreanu. 2000. *Les amphithéâtres de la Dacie romaine*. Cluj-Napoca
- Ando, C. 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley.
- Andreau, J. 1999. *Banking and Business in the Roman World*. J. Lloyd, trans. Cambridge.
- Arnott, W.G. 1996. *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Audin, A. 1979. "L'amphithéâtre des Trois Gaules à Lyon: nouvelles campagnes de fouilles (1971-1972, 1976-1978)." *Gallia* 37: 85-98.
- , 1969. "L'amphithéâtre des Trois-Gaules, à Lugdunum." *Latomus* 28: 19-27.
- Audin, A. and M. Leglay. 1970. "L'amphithéâtre des Trois-Gaules à Lyon: première campagne de fouilles." *Gallia* 28:67-89.
- Badian, E. 1972. *Publicans and Sinners: Private Enterprise in the Service of the Roman Republic*. Ithaca.
- Bailey, C. 2002. Διανομαί: *Distributions of Money in the Greek Cities of Roman Asia Minor*. M.A. diss., McMaster University.

- Baker, M. 2005. "Who was Sitting in the Theatre at Miletos? An Epigraphical Application of a Novel Theory." *Journal for the Study of Judaism*. 36.4:397-416.
- Ball, W. 2001. *Rome in the East: The Transformation of an Empire*. London.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1969. *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome*. London.
- Balty, J.-C. 1983. *Curia Ordinis. Recherches d'architecture et d'urbanisme antiques sur les curies provinciales du monde romain*. Brussels.
- Bandelli, G. 1987. "Per una storia della classe dirigente di Aquileia repubblicana: le iscrizioni da un edificio di spettacolo." *Antichità Altoadriatiche* 29: 97-127.
- Barret, J.C. 1997. "Romanization: a critical comment." in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism. Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*. [JRA Supplementary Series no. 23]. D.J. Mattingly, ed. 51-64. Portsmouth.
- Barton, C.A. 1993. *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: The Gladiator and the Monster*. Princeton.
- , 1989. "The Scandal of the Arena." *Representations* 27:1-36.
- Bartsch, S. 1994. *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Bateman, N.C.W. 1997. "The London Amphitheatre: Excavations 1987-1996." *Britannia* 28:51-85.
- Baur, P.V.C. ed. 1933. *The Excavations at Dura-Europus. Preliminary Report of Fourth Season of Work October 1930-March 1931*. New Haven.
- Beacham, R.C. 1999. *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*. New Haven.
- , 1992. *The Roman Theatre and its Audience*. Cambridge.
- Beard, M. 1980. "The Sexual Status of the Vestal Virgins." *JRS* 70:12-27.
- Beare, W. 1939. "Seats in the Greek and Roman Theatre." *CR* 53:51-55.

- Beltrán, F. and F. Pina. 2003. "Teatro y sociedad en el Occidente romano." in *El Teatro Romano: La Puesta en Escena*. Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza, ed. 41-52. Zaragoza.
- Béranger, J. 1970. "Ordres et classes d'après Cicéron." In *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique Caen 25-26 avril 1969*, 225-242. Paris.
- Beschaouch, A. 1966. "La mosaïque de chasse à l'amphithéâtre découverte à Smirat en Tunisie." *CRAI* 134-157.
- Bieber, M. 1939. *History of the Greek and Roman Theatre*. Princeton
- Bingham, S. 1999. "Security at the Games in the Early Imperial Period." *EchCl* 18:369-379.
- Binsfeld, W. 1967. "Die Nameninschriften auf den Sitzsteinen des Kulttheaters im Trierer Altbachtal." *Trierer Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst des Trierer Landes und seiner Nachbargebiete* 30:101-109.
- Boak, A.E.R. 1916. "The Magistri of Campania and Delos." *CP* 11.1:25-45.
- Boatwright, M.T. 2000. "Just Window Dressing? Imperial Women as Architectural Sculpture." in *I Claudia II. Women in Roman Art and Society*. D.E.E. Kleiner and S.B. Matheson, eds. 61-75. Austin.
- Bomgardner, D.L. 2000. *The Story of the Roman Amphitheatre*. London
- , 1993. "A new era for amphitheatre studies." *JRA* 6:375-390.
- , 1991. "Amphitheatres on the Fringe." *JRA* 4:486-503.
- Bonner, R.J. and G. Smith. 1943. "Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony." *CP* 38.1:1-12.
- Borkowski, Z. 1981. *Inscriptions des Factions à Alexandrie*. Warsaw.
- Bouley, E. 1983. "Les theatres cultuels de Belgique et des Germanies. Réflexions sur les ensembles architecturaux theatres-temples." *Latomus* 42:546-571.
- Bowersock, G.W. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford.

Broneer, O. 1932. *Corinth X: The Odeum*. Cambridge.

Brown, S. 1991. "Death as Decoration: Scenes from the Arena of Roman Domestic Mosaics." in *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. A. Richlin, ed. 180-211. New York.

Browning, R. 1952. "The Riot of A.D. 387 in Antioch: The Role of Theatrical Claques in the Later Empire." *JRS* 42:13-20.

Brunt, P.A. 1988. "The Equites in the Late Republic." In *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, edited by P.A. Brunt, 144-193. Oxford.

-----, 1984. "The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime." *CQ* 34:423-444.

-----, 1983. "Princeps and Equites." *JRS* 73:42-75.

-----, 1971. *Italian Manpower 225 B.C. - A.D. 14*. Oxford.

-----, 1961. "The Lex Valeria Cornelia." *JRS* 51: 71-83.

Buonocore, M. 1992. *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'occidente romano. III. Regiones Italiae II-V, Sicilia, Sardinia e Corsica*. Rome.

Cameron, A. 1976. *Circus Factions* Oxford.

Carettoni, G. F. 1956-1958. "Le gallerie ipogee del Foro Romano e i ludi gladiatori forensi." *BullCom* 76:23-44.

Carreté, J.M., S. Keay and M. Millett. 1995. *A Roman provincial capital and its hinterland: the survey of the territory of Tarragona, Spain, 1985-1990*. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology.

Carter, M.J.D. 2003. "Gladiatorial Ranking and the *SC de pretiis gladiatorum minuendis*. (CIL II.6278 = ILS 5163)." *Phoenix* 57:83-111.

-----, 1999. *The Presentation of Gladiatorial Spectacles in the Greek East: Roman Culture and Greek Identity*. Ph.D. diss., McMaster University.

Chamberland, G. 2007. "A Gladiatorial Show Produced *In Sordidam Mercedem* (Tacitus Ann. 4.62)." *Phoenix* 61: 136-149.

-----, 2001. *The production of shows in the cities of the Roman empire: a study of the Latin epigraphic evidence*. Ph.D. diss., McMaster University.

Chastagnol, A. 1992. *Le sénat romain à l'époque impériale: Recherches sur la composition de l'Assemblée et le statut de ses membres*. Paris.

-----, 1984a. "La naissance de l' 'ordo senatorius'." In *Des Ordres A Rome*. C. Nicolet, ed. 175-198. Paris.

-----, 1984b. "'Latus Clavus' et 'Adlectio': L'accès des hommes nouveaux au sénat romain sous le Haut-Empire." in *Des Ordres A Rome*. C. Nicolet, ed. 199-216. Paris.

-----, 1979. "Les femmes dans l'ordre sénatorial: titulature et rang social à Rome." *RHist* 103:3-28.

-----, 1966. *Le Sénat Romain sous le règne d'Odoacre: Recherches sur l'Épigraphie du Colisée au Ve Siècle*. Bonn.

-----, 1964. "Les inscriptions des gradins sénatoriaux du Colisée." in *Akte des IV Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik*. Wien.

Christol, M. 1982. "Les naviculaires d'Arles et les structures du grand commerce maritime sous l'empire romain." *ProvHist* 127: 5-14.

-----, 1971. "Remarques sur les naviculaires d'Arles." *Latomus* 30:643-663.

Christopherson, A.J. 1968. "The Provincial Assembly of the Three Gauls in the Julio-Claudian Period." *Historia* 17:351-366.

Cohen, B. 1984. "Some neglected 'ordines': The apparitorial status-group." In *Des Ordres A Rome*. C. Nicolet, ed. 23-60. Paris.

-----, 1975. "La notion d' 'ordo' dans la Rome antique." *BassBudé* 34: 259-282.

- Coleman, K.M. 2003. "Euergetism in its Place. Where was the amphitheatre in Augustan Rome?" in *'Bread and Circuses'. Euergetism and municipal patronage in Roman Italy*. K. Lomas and T. Cornell, eds. 61-88. London.
- , 2000. "Entertaining Rome." in *Ancient Rome: The Archaeology of the Eternal City*. J. Coulston and H. Dodge, eds. 210-258. Oxford.
- , 1998. "The Contagion of the Throng: Absorbing Violence in the Roman World." *Hermathena* 164:65-88.
- Corzo Sánchez, R. 1994a. "Notas Sobre el anfiteatro de Carmona y otros anfiteatros de la Betica." in *El Anfiteatro en la Hispania Romana*. J.M. Álvarez Martínez and J. J. Enríquez Navascués, eds. 239-246. Badajoz.
- , 1994b. "El anfiteatro de Italica." in *El Anfiteatro en la Hispania Romana*. J.M. Álvarez Martínez and J. J. Enríquez Navascués, eds. 187-212. Badajoz.
- Crawford, M.H., ed. 1996. *Roman Statutes*. Vols 1-2. London.
- , 1993. "Arranging Seating [analysis of chapter 127 of the Lex Coloniae Genetivae]." *Athenaeum* 71:613-618.
- , 1978. *The Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Csapo, E. and W.J. Slater. 1995. *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor.
- Cumont, F. 1926. *Fouilles de Doura-Europus (1922-1923)*. Paris.
- Curchin, L.A. 1990. *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain*. Toronto.
- D'Andria, F. and T. Ritti. 1985. *Le sculture del teatro: I rilievi con i cicli di Apollo e Artemide*. Rome.
- D'Arms, J.H. 2000. "Memory, Money, and Status at Misenum: Three New Inscriptions from the Collegium of the Augustales." *JRS* 90:126-144.
- , 1981. *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.
- de Bernardi Ferrero, D. 1966-1974. *Teatri classici in Asia Minore*. Vols. 1- 4. (Rome).

- Deininger, J. 1965. *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit. Von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Munich.
- Delattre, P. 1898. "Fouilles dans l'amphithéâtre de Carthage (1896-1897)." *MAntFr* 57:135-187.
- Demougin, S. 1994a. "L'ordre équestre sous Domitien." *Pallas* 40:289-299.
- , 1994b. "A propos des élites locales en Italie." in *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien*. 353-376. Rome.
- , 1993. "Appartenir à l'ordre équestre Au II^{ème} siècle." *Prosopographie Und Sozialgeschichte Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserzeitlichen Prosopographie Kolloquium Köln* 24. - 26. November 1991. 232-250. (Köln 1993).
- , 1988a. *L'ordre équestre sous les Julio-claudiens*. Rome.
- , 1984. "De l'esclavage à l'anneau d'or du chevalier." in *Des Ordres A Rome*. C. Nicolet, ed. 217-241. Paris.
- Demougin, S., Devijver, H., and Raespsaet-Charlier, M.T., eds. 1999. *L'Ordre Équestre d'un Aristocratie (Ile siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Rome.
- Dilke, O.A.W. 1948. "The Greek Theatre Cavea." *BSA* 43:125-192.
- Dmitriev, S. 2005. *City government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford.
- Dodge, H. 1999. "Amusing the Masses: Buildings for Entertainment and Leisure in the Roman World." in *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*. D.S. Potter and D.J. Mattingly, eds. 205-255. Ann Arbor.
- Downey, S.B. 1988. *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*. Princeton.
- Duncan-Jones, R.P. 1974. *The Economy of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- Dupont, F. 1985. *L'acteur roi, ou le théâtre dans la Rome antique*. Paris.

- Dupré i Raventós, X. 1994. "El Anfiteatro de Tarraco." in *El Anfiteatro en la Hispania Romana*. J.M. Álvarez Martínez and J.J. Enríquez Navascués, eds. 79-85. Junta de Extremadura.
- Duthoy, R. 1970. "Notes onomastiques sur les *Augustales*: cognomina et indication de statut." *AntCl* 39:88-105.
- Eck, W. 1990. "Senatorial Self-Representation: Developments in the Augustan Period." in *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*. F. Millar and E. Segal, eds. 129-167. Oxford.
- Edmondson, J. 2002. "Public Spectacles and Roman Social Relations." in *Ludi Romani: espectáculos en Hispania Romana*. T. Nogales Basarrate and A. Castellano Hernández, eds. 41-64. Mérida.
- , 1996. "Dynamic Arenas: Gladiatorial Presentations in the City of Rome and the Construction of Roman Society during the Early Empire." In *Roman Theater and Society: E. Togo Salmon Papers I*, edited by W.J. Slater, 69-112. Ann Arbor.
- Edwards, C. 1997. "Unspeakable Professions: Public Performance and Prostitution in Ancient Rome." In *Roman Sexualities*, edited by J.P. Hallett and M.B. Skinner, 66-95. Princeton.
- , 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in ancient Rome*. Cambridge.
- Erskine, A. 1997. "Greekness and Uniqueness: The Cult of the Senate in the Greek East." *Phoenix* 51.1:25-37.
- Étienne, R., I. Piso, and A. Diaconescu. 1990a. "Les deux forums de la Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica Sarmizegetusa." *REA* 92:273-296.
- , 1990b. "Les propylées du forum civil de Sarmizegetusa (Roumanie)." *CRAI* 91-113.
- Étienne, R. 1965a. "La naissance de l'amphithéâtre, le mot et la chose." *REL* 43:213-220.
- , 1965b. "Les Sénateurs Espagnols sous Trajan et Hadrian." in *Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne*. 55-85. Paris.
- Evangelides, D.E. 1958. "Ἡ ἀνασκαφὴ τοῦ θεάτρου Μυτιλήνης." *Prakt* 12:230-232.

Fabricius, E. and C. Schuchhardt. 1902. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*. Berlin.

Fiechter, E. 1931. *Das Theater in Megalopolis*. Stuttgart.

Fishwick, D. 1997. "The Provincial Centre at Camulodunum: Towards an Historical Context." *Britannia* 28:31-50.

-----, 1996a. "The Dedication of the *Ara Trium Galliarum*." *Latomus* 55.1:87-100.

-----, 1996b. "Four temples at Tarraco." in *Subject and Ruler: the cult of the ruling power in classical antiquity*. *JRA Supplementary Series* 17. Ann Arbor.

-----, 1987- 2004. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*, vols. I.1, I.2, II.1, II.2, III.1, III.2, III.3. Leiden.

-----, 1982. "The Altar of Augustus and the Municipal Cult of Tarraco." *MM* 23:222-233.

-----, 1972. "The Temple of the Three Gauls." *JRS* 62: 46-52.

Fiumi, E. 1955. "Volterra - Scavi nell'area del teatro romano degli anni 1950-1953." *NSc* 123-150.

Flory, M.B. 1993. "Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome." *TAPA* 123:287-308.

Fontenrose, J. 1988. *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions*. Berkeley.

Forbes, C.A. 1933. *Neoi. A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations*. Middletown.

Forbis, E.P. 1990. "Women's Public Image in Italian Honorary Inscriptions." *AJP* 3:493-512.

Formigé, J. 1965. "L'amphithéâtre d'Arles." *RA* 1:1-46.

-----, 1914. "Remarques diverses sur les théâtres romains à propos de ceux d'Arles et d'Orange." *MémAcInscr* 13:25-89.

Frederiksen, M. 1984. *Campania*. N. Purcell, ed. London.

- Freeman, P.W.M. 1997. "Mommensen through to Haverfield: the origins of Romanization studies in late 19th-c. Britain." in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism. Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*. [JRA Supplementary Series no. 23] . D.J. Mattingly, ed. 27-50. Portsmouth.
- Frézouls, E. 1990. "Les monuments des spectacles dans la ville: théâtre et amphithéâtre." in *Spectacula I: Gladiateurs et amphithéâtres*. C. Domergue, C. Landes and J.-M. Pailler, eds. 77-92. Lattes.
- , 1983a. "Aspects de l'histoire architecturale du théâtre romain." *ANRW* II, 12.1: 343-441.
- , 1983b. "La construction du *Theatrum Lapideum* et son contexte politique." in *Théâtre et spectacles dans l'antiquité: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 5-7 novembre 1981*. 193-214. Travaux de Recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques, 7. Strasbourg.
- Futrell, A. 2000. *Blood in the Arena: The Spectacle of Roman Power*. Austin.
- Gagé, J. 1964. *Les classes sociales dans l'Empire romain*. Paris.
- Galsterer, H. 1971. *Untersuchungen zum Römischen Städtewesen auf der Iberischen Halbinsel*. Berlin.
- Gardner, J.F. 1986. *Women in Roman Law and Society*. London: Routledge.
- Garnsey, P. 1974. "Aspects of the Decline of the Urban Aristocracy of the Empire." *ANRW* 2.1:230-252.
- , 1971. "Honorarium Decurionatus." *Historia* 20:309-325.
- Garnsey, P. and R. Saller. 1987. *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society, and Culture*. Berkeley.
- Gascou, J. 1976. "Les curies africaines: origine punique out italienne?" *AntAfr* 10:46-48.
- Gauckler, P. 1907. "Le théâtre de Carthage." *NouvArch* 15:452-472.

- Geagen, D.J. 1967. *The Athenian Constitution After Sulla*. [Hesperia Supplement 12]. Princeton.
- Gebhard, E. R. 1981. "The Theatre at Stobi: a summary." in *Studies in the Antiquities of Stobi* 3. B. Aleksova and J. Wiseman, eds. 13-27. Skopje.
- , 1975. "Protective Devices in Roman Theaters." in *Studies in the Antiquity of Stobi* Volume II. J. Wiseman, ed. Beograd.
- Goldhill, S. 2001. *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge.
- , 1994. "Representing Democracy: Women at the Great Dionysia." in *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. R. Osborne and S. Hornblower, eds. 347-369. Oxford.
- Golvin, J.-C. 1988. *L'Amphithéâtre romain: essai sur la théorisation de sa forme et de ses fonctions*. Paris.
- González, J. 1986. "The Lex Imitana: A New Copy of the Flavian Municipal Law." *JRS* 76:147-243.
- Gose, E. 1972. *Der Gallo-romische Tempelbezirk im Altbachtal zu Trier*. Mainz.
- Grant, M. 1992. *A social history of Greece and Rome*. New York.
- , 1967. *Gladiators*. London.
- Gregory, A. P. 1994. "'Powerful images': responses to portraits and the political uses of images in Rome." *JRA* 7:80-99.
- Grénier, A. 1958. *Manuel d'archéologie gallo-romaine. Volume III. L'Architecture. Fasc. 2: Ludi et circenses, théâtres, amphithéâtres, cirques*. Paris.
- Gros, P. 2002. "La fonction politique des monuments de spectacle dans le monde romain sous le Haut-Empire." in *Ludi Romani: espectáculos en Hispania Romana*. 25-40. T. Nogales Basarrate and A. Castellano Hernández, eds. Mérida.

- , 1994a. "Les théâtres en Italie au 1er siècle de notre ère: situation et fonctions dans l'urbanisme impérial." in *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien*. 285-307. Rome.
- , 1994b. "Le schéma vitruvien du théâtre latin et sa signification dans le système normatif du *De architectura*." *RA* 1:57-80.
- , 1994c. "L'amphithéâtre dans la ville politique 'culturelle' et urbanisme aux deux premiers siècles de l'empire." in *El anfiteatro en la Hispania Romana*. J.M. Alvarez Martínez and J.J. Enríquez Navascués, eds. 13-29. Badajoz.
- , 1990. "Théâtre et culte impérial en Gaule Narbonnaise et dans la Péninsule Ibérique." *Stadtbild und Ideologie. Die Monumentalisierung hispanische Städte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit*. W. Trillmich and P. Zanker, eds. 381-390. Munich.
- Gruen, E.S. 1992. *Culture and national identity in Republican Rome*. London.
- Gsell, S. 1965. *Inscriptions Latines de L'Algérie. Volume I*. Rome.
- Gunderson, E. 2003. "The Flavian Amphitheatre: All the World As Stage." in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, eds. 637-658. Leiden.
- , 1996. "The Ideology of the Arena." *ClassAnt* 15:113-151.
- Haigh, A.E. 1889. *The Attic Theatre*. Oxford.
- Hallett J. P. 1989. "Women as *Same* and *Other* in Classical Roman Elite." *Helios* 16.1:59-78.
- Haley, E.W. 2003. *Baetica Felix. People and Prosperity in Southern Spain from Caesar to Septimius Severus*. Austin.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1998. "The Branchidae at Didyma and in Sogdiana." *CQ* 48.2:339-344.
- Hanson, J.A. 1959. *Roman Theater-Temples*. Princeton.
- Hanson, W.S. 1997. "Forces of change and methods of control." in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism. Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*. [JRA Supplementary Series no. 23] . D.J. Mattingly, ed. 67-80. Portsmouth.
- Heberdey, R. et al. 1912. *Forschungen in Ephesos, Band II. Das Theater von Ephesos*. Brün.

- Hellegouarc'h, J. 1972. *Le vocabulaire Latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*. Paris.
- Hemelrijk, E.A. 2005. "Priestesses of the Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Titles and Function." *AntCl* 2005:137-170.
- Henderson, J. 1991. "Women and the Athenian Dramatic Festivals." *TAPA* 121:133-147.
- Henderson, M.I. 1963. "The Establishment of the Equester Ordo." *JRS* 53:61-72.
- Herrmann, P. 1998. *Inscriptionen von Milet. Teil 2. Inscriptionen n. 407-1019*. Berlin.
- Hill, H. 1939. "Census Equester." *AJP* 60:357-362.
- Hingley, R. 2005. *Globalizing Roman Culture. Unity, diversity and empire*. London.
- , 1997. "Resistance and domination: social change in Roman Britain." in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism. Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*. [JRA Supplementary Series no. 23] . D.J. Mattingly, ed. 81-100. Portsmouth.
- Hoff, M.C. 1989. "Civil Disobedience and Unrest in Augustan Athens." *Hesperia* 58.3:267-276.
- Hömmel, H. 1975. "Juden und Christen im kaiserzeitlichen Milet. Überlegungen zur Theaterinschrift." *IstMitt* 25:167-195.
- Hopkins, K. 1983. *Death and Renewal*. Cambridge.
- , 1974. "Élite Mobility in the Roman Empire." In *Studies in Ancient Society*, edited by M.I. Finley, 103-120. London.
- Hopkins, K. and M. Beard. 2005. *The Colosseum*. London.
- Hübner, E. 1858. "Iscrizioni esistenti sui sedili di teatri ed anfiteatri antichi." *Monumenti, annali e bulletini pubblicati dall'istituto di corrispondenza archeologia*.
- HülSEN, C. 1894. "Il posto degli Arvali nel Colosseo e la capacità dei teatri di Roma antica." *BullComm* 22:312-24.

- Humphrey, J.H. 1986. *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot Racing*. London.
- Izenour, G.C. 1992. *Roofed Theatres of Classical Antiquity*. New Haven.
- Jansen, B. 2005. "Römische Theater in der Baetica." *MM* 46:289-416.
- Jones, A.H.M. 1949. "The Roman Civil Service (Clerical and Sub-Clerical Grades)." *JRS* 39:38-55.
- , 1940. *The Greek City*. Oxford.
- , 1928. "Inscriptions from Jerash." *JRS* 18:144-178.
- Jones, N.F. 1987. *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*. [Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 176]. Philadelphia.
- Jory, E.J. 1986. "Gladiators in the Theatre." *CQ* 36:537-539.
- , 1970. "Associations of Actors in Rome." *Hermes* 98:224-253.
- Jouffroy, H. 1986. *La construction publique en Italie et dans l'Afrique romaine*. Strasbourg.
- Katz, M.A. 1998. "Did the Women of Ancient Athens Attend the Theater in the Eighteenth Century?" *CP* 93.2: 105-124.
- Kleijwegt, H. 1992. "The Value of Empty Honours." *Epigraphica*. 54:131-142.
- Kolb, F. 1990. "Sitzstufeninschriften aus dem Stadion von Saïttai (Lydia)." *EpigAnat* 15:107-119.
- , 1974. "Zur Geschichte der Stadt Hierapolis in Phrygien Phylleninschriften im Theater." *ZPE* 15:255-270.
- Kolendo, J. 1981. "La répartition des places aux spectacles et la stratification sociale dans l'Empire Romain." *Ktèma* 6:301-315.
- , 1979. "Deux amphithéâtres dans une seule ville. Le cas d'Aquincum et de Carnuntum." *ArcheologiaRom* 30:39-55.

- Kotula, T. 1968. *Les curies municipales en Afrique romaine*. Wroclaw.
- Kyle, D.G. 1998. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London.
- Le Bas, P. and W.H. Waddington. 1972. *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines recueillies en Asie Mineure*. Vol. I. Hildesheim.
- Le Glay, M. 1991. "Le culte d'Auguste dans les villes augustéennes...et les autres." in *Les villes augustéennes de Gaule. Actes du colloque international d'Autun 6, 7, 8 juin 1985*. 117-126. Autun.
- Le Roux, P. 1994. "L'évolution du culte impérial dans les provinces occidentales d'Auguste à Domitien." *Pallas* 40:397-411.
- Lequément, R. 1968. *Fouilles à l'amphithéâtre de Tebessa (1965-1968)*. Algiers.
- Levick, B. 2000. *The Government of the Roman Empire*. London.
- , 1983. "The *Senatus Consultum* from Larinum." *JRS* 73:97-115.
- Lewis, N. 1974. *Greek Historical Documents. The Roman Principate: 27 B.C. – 285 A.D.* Toronto.
- Lilja, S. 1985. "Seating Problems in Roman Theatre and Circus." *Arctos* 19:67-73.
- Lim, R. 1999. "In the 'Temple of Laughter': Visual and Literary Representations of Spectators at Roman Games." in *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon, eds. 343-365. New Haven.
- Longo, O. 1990. "The Theater of the Polis." in *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. J.J. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin, eds. 13-19. Princeton.
- Luca Gregori, G. 1989. *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'occidente romano. II. Regiones Italiae VI-XI*. Rome.
- Maas, H. 1972. *Die Prohedrie des Dionysos Theaters in Athen*. Munich.
- MacMullen, R. 1986. "Women's Power in the Principate." *Klio* 68: 434-443.

- , 1980. "Women in Public in the Roman Empire." *Historia* 29:208-218.
- , 1974. *Roman Social Relations 50 B.C. to A.D. 284*. New Haven.
- , 1963. *Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire*. Cambridge.
- Magen, Y. 1984. "The Roman Theatre in Schechem." In *Zev Vilnay's Jubilee Volume*. E. Schiller, ed. 269-277. Jerusalem.
- Magie, D. 1950. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ*. Princeton.
- Maiuri, A. 1955. *Studi e ricerche sull'anfiteatro Flavio puteolano*. *MemNap* 3. Naples.
- Makowiecka E. 1971. "The numbering of the seating places at the Roman theatre of Kom El-Dikka in Alexandria." *Acta Conventus XI Eirene* : 479-483.
- Malavolta, M. 1978. "A proposito del nuovo s.c. da Larino." in *Sesta miscellanea greca e romana (studi pubblicati dell'Istituto Italiano per la storia antica XXVII)*. 347-382. Rome.
- Marshall, A.J. 1975. "Women and the Provinces." *AncSoc* 6:109-127.
- Martin-Bueno, M. 1992. "Utilización politico-religiosa de los teatros romanos." in *Spectacula II: Le théâtre antique et ses spectacles*. C. Landes, ed. 233-240. Lattes.
- Mayer, M. and J. Massó. 1990. "Les inscriptions dels seients de la càmara de l'Amfiteatre de Tàrraco." in *L'amfiteatre romà de Tarragona, la basilica visigòtica i l'eglésia romànica*. Taller Escola d'Arqueologia (Ted'A), ed. 160-173. Tarragona.
- McGinn, T.A.J. 1992. "The SC from Larinum and the Repression of Adultery at Rome." *ZPE* 93:273-295.
- Meijer, F. and O. van Nijf. 1992. *Trade, Transport and Society in the Ancient World. A sourcebook*. London.
- Melchor Gil, E. and J.F. Rodríguez Neila. 2002. "Sociedad, espectáculos y evergetismo en Hispania." in *Ludi Romani: espectáculos en Hispania Romana*. 135-156. T. Nogales Basarrate and A. Castellano Hernández, eds. Mérida.

- Michel, A. 1970. "Ordres et classes chez les historiens romains." In *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique Caen 25-26 avril 1969*, 243-257. Paris.
- Mihailov, G., ed. 1961. *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae*. Vol III. Sofia.
- Mikalson, J.D. 1998. "Religion in Hellenistic Athens." Berkeley.
- Millar, F. 2001. *The Roman Near East 31 BC - AD 337*. Cambridge.
- , 1983. "Empire and City, Augustus to Julian: obligations, excuses and status." *JRS* 76:147-238.
- , 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC - AD 337)*. London.
- Miltner, F. 1933. "Das zweite Amphitheater von Carnuntum." in *Der Römische Limes in Österreich XVII*. 1-72. Wien.
- Miniero, P, ed. 2000. *The sacellum of the augustales at miseno*. Translated by C. Fordham. Naples.
- Mitchell, S. 1999. "The Cult of *Theos Hypsistos* between Pagans, Jews, and Christians." in *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede, eds. 81-148. Oxford.
- , 1993. *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Volume I. The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule*. Oxford.
- , 1990. "Festivals, Games and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor." *JRS* 80: 183-93.
- Moore, T.J. 1994. "Seats and Social Status in the Plautine Theatre." *CJ* 90.2:113-123.
- Moretti, J.-C. 1992. "L'adoption des theatres de Grèce aux spectacles impériaux." in *Spectacula II. Le theatre antique et ses spectacles*. C. Landes, ed. 179-185. Lattes.
- Moreau, J. 1956-1958. "Ein Weihedenkmal des Ritona-Kultes; Neufund von Pachten (Saar)." *Trier Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst des Trierer Landes und seiner Nachbargebiete* 24-26:115-119.

- Muscettola, S. A. 2000. "Miseno: culto imperiale e politica nel complesso degli Augustali." *MdI* 107:79-108.
- Navarro Caballero, M. 2001. "Les femmes de l'élite hispano-romaine, entre la famille et la vie publique." in *Élites Hispaniques*. M. Navarro Caballero and S. Demougin, eds. 191-201. Paris.
- Nesselhauf, H. 1939. "Neue Inschriften aus dem römischen Germanien und den angrenzenden Gebieten." *BerRGK* 27.
- Newbold, R.F. 1974. "Some Social and Economic Consequences of the A.D. 64 Fire at Rome." *Latomus* 33:858-869.
- Newby, Z. 2003. "Art and Identity in Asia Minor." in *Roman Imperialism and Provincial Art*. S. Scott and J. Webster, eds. Cambridge.
- Nicolet, C. 1990. "Augustus, Government, and the Propertied Classes." in *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*. F. Millar and E. Segal, eds. 89-128. Oxford.
- , 1984a. "Le cens sénatorial sous la République et sous Auguste." In *Des Ordres A Rome*, edited by C. Nicolet, 143-174. Paris.
- , 1984b. "Les ordres romains: définition, recrutement et fonctionnement." In *Des Ordres A Rome*, edited by C. Nicolet, 7-21. Paris.
- , 1966. *L'ordre équestre à l'époque Républicaine (312 - 43 av. J.-C.) Tome 1 Définitions juridiques et structures sociales*. Paris.
- Nicols, J. 1989. "Patrona Civitatis: Gender and Civic Patronage." in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, Vol 5. 117-142. C. Deroux, ed. Brussels.
- , 1988. "On the Standard Size of the Ordo Decurionum." *ZRG* 105:712-719.
- Nock, A.D. 1934. "Seviri and Augustales." *AIPhOr* 2:627-638.
- Ober, J. and B. Strauss. 1990. "Drama, Political Rhetoric, and the Discourse of Athenian Democracy." in *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin, eds. 237-270. Princeton.

- Oliver, J.H. 1958. "Gerusiae and Augustales." *Historia* 7:472-496.
- Orlandi, S. 2004. *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romana. VI. Anfiteatri e strutture annesse con una nuova edizione e commento delle iscrizioni del Colosseo*. Rome.
- Ostrow, S.E. 1990. "The Augustales in the Augustan Scheme." in *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*. K.A. Raafaub and M. Toher, eds. 364-379. Berkeley.
- , 1985. "Augustales along the Bay of Naples: A Case for their Early Growth." *Historia* 34:64-101.
- Padel, R. 1990. "Making Space Speak." in *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. J.J. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin, eds. 336-365. Princeton.
- Pais, H. 1884. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Supplementa Italica*. Rome.
- Paparatti, E. 1988. "Osservazioni Sugli Stucchi." in *Anfiteatro Flavio. Immagine, Testimonianze, Spettacoli*. 83-89. Rome.
- Parke, H.W. 1986. "The Temple of Apollo at Didyma: The Building and Its Function." *JHS* 106: 121-131.
- Parker, H.N. 1999. "The Observed of All Observers: Spectacle, Applause, and Cultural Poetics in the Roman Theater Audience." In *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon, eds. 163-179. New Haven.
- Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.
- Pasoli, A. 1950. *Acta fratrum Arvalium quae post annum MDCCCLXXIV reperta sunt*. Bologna.
- Pensabene, P. 1996. "Classi dirigenti, programme decorative, culto imperiale: Il caso de Tarraco." in *Colonia Patricia Corduba: una reflexion arqueológica*. 197-219. Seville.
- Pérez, A.P. 1976. "Los Espectadores, la *Lex Roscia Theatralis* y la Organización de la *Cavea* en los Teatros Romanos." *Zephyrus* 26/27:435-442.
- Petersen, E. and F. von Luschan. 1889. *Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien II*. Vienna.

- Pflaum, H.G. 1965. "La part prise par les chevaliers Romains originaires d'Espagne à l'administration impériale." in *Les Empereurs Romains d'Espagne*. 87-121. Paris.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Oxford.
- Pintado, J.A. 2001. "La participación de las elites en la mejora urbanística y el equipamiento ornamental de sus ciudades entre Tiberio y Trajano: el ejemplo de la provincia Lusitania." in *De Augusto a Trajano: un siglo en la historia de Hispania*. C. Castillo, F. Javier Navarro, R. Martínez, eds. 239-264. Pamplona.
- Plass, P. 1995. *The Game of Death in Ancient Rome: Arena Sport and Political Suicide*. Madison.
- Pleket, H.W. 1983. "Urban elites and business in the Greek part of the Roman Empire." in *Trade in the Ancient Economy*. P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins, and C.R. Whittaker, eds. 131-144. London.
- Podlecki, A. 1990. "Could Women Attend the Theatre in Ancient Athens? A Collection of Testimonia." *AncW* 21:27-43.
- Polacco, L. 1981. "Théâtre, société, organisation de l'État." in *Théâtre et spectacles dans l'antiquité: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 5-7 novembre 1981*. Travaux de Recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques, 7. 5-15. Strasbourg.
- Potter, D.S. 2002. "Entertainers in the Roman Empire." in *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*. D.S. Potter and D.J. Mattingly, eds. 256-325. Ann Arbor.
- , 1993. "Martyrdom as Spectacle." in *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. R. Scodel, ed. 53-88. Ann Arbor.
- Price, S.R.F. 1984. *Rituals and Power: The Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
- , 1980. "Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult." *JRS* 70:28-43.
- Purcell, N. 1986. "Livia and the Womanhood of Rome." *PCPS* 32:78-105.
- , 1983. "The Apparitores: A study in social mobility." *PBSR* 51:125-173.

- Raaflaub, K.A., ed. 1986. *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders*. Berkeley.
- Ramírez Sádaba, J.L. 1994. "Epigrafía del anfiteatro romano de Mérida." in *El Anfiteatro en la Hispania Romana*. 285-299. Mérida.
- Ramón Mélida, J. 1925. *Catálogo Monumental de España. Provincia de Badajoz*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Imprenta de la Ciudad Lineal.
- Rawson, E. 1987. "Discrimina Ordinum: The *Lex Julia Theatralis*." *PBSR* 55:83-114.
- , 1985. "Theatrical Life in Republican Rome and Italy." *PBSR* 53:97-113.
- Rea, R. 1988. "Recenti osservazioni sulla struttura dell'anfiteatro flavio." in *Anfiteatro Flavio. Immagine, Testimonianze, Spettacoli*. 9-22. Rome.
- Rehm, A. 1958. *Didyma. Teil 2. Die Inschriften*. Berlin.
- Reinhold, M. 1971. "Usurpation of Status and Status Symbols in the Roman Empire." *Historia* 20:275-302.
- Retzleff, A. 2003. "Near Eastern Theatres in Late Antiquity." *Phoenix* 52: 115-138.
- Retzleff, A. and A.M. Mjely. 2004. "Seat Inscriptions in the Odeum at Gerasa (Jerash)." *BASOR*. 336:37-47.
- Reynolds, J.M. 1982. *Aphrodisias and Rome*. London.
- Rice, E.E. 1983. *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Oxford.
- Richards, G.C. 1892. "Inscriptions of Megalopolis and Neighbourhood." in *Excavations at Megalopolis 1890-1891*. E.A. Gardner et al., eds. 122-126. [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenistic Studies Supplementary Papers no. 1]. London.
- Rives, J. 2001. "Imperial Cult and Native Traditions in Roman North Africa." *CJ* 96.4:425-436.
- Robert, L. 1971. *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient grec*. Paris.

- , "Rehm, Inschriften von Didyma." in *Opera Minora Selecta Tome III*. L. Robert, ed. 1622-1639. Amsterdam.
- Rogers, G.M. 1991a. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos. Foundation Myths of a Roman City*. London.
- , 1991b. "Demosthenes of Oenoanda and Models of Euergetism." *JRS* 81:91-100.
- Rosenfeld, B. and J. Menirav. 1999. "The Ancient Synagogue as an Economic Center." *JNES* 58.4:259-276.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1926. *The Social & Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Roueché, C. 1995. "Aurarii in the Auditoria." *ZPE* 105:37-50.
- , 1993. *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias*. London.
- , 1984. "Acclamations in the Later Roman Empire: New Evidence from Aphrodisias." *JRS* 74:181-199.
- Saria, B. 1940. "Die Inschriften des Theaters von Stobi." *WJh* 32:3-34.
- Sartre, M. 1991. *L'Orient Romain: Provinces et sociétés provinciales en Méditerranée orientale d'Auguste aux Sévères*. Paris.
- Šašel Kos, M. 1999. "Aspects of the Sevirate and *Augustalitas* in the Northeastern Adriatic Area." *Histria Antiqua*. 5:173-181.
- Scamuzzi U. 1970a. "Studio sulla Lex Roscia theatralis (con un breve appendice sulla gens Roscia)." *RSC* 18.1:5-57.
- , 1970b. "Studio sulla Lex Roscia theatralis (con un breve appendice sulla gens Roscia)." *RSC* 18.3:374-447.
- , 1969a. "Studio sulla Lex Roscia theatralis (con un breve appendice sulla gens Roscia)." *RSC* 17.2:133-165.
- , 1969b. "Studio sulla Lex Roscia theatralis (con un breve appendice sulla gens Roscia)." *RSC* 17.3:259-319.

- Schäfer, T. 1989. *Imperii Insignia: Sella curulis und Fasces. Zur Repräsentation Römischer Magistrate*. Mainz.
- Schillinger-Häfele, U. 1977. "Vierter Nachtrag zu CIL XIII und zweiter Nachtrag zu Fr. Vollmer, Inscriptiones Baivariae Romanae. Inschriften aus dem deutschen Anteil der germanischen Provinzen und des Treverergebietes sowie Rätien und Noricum." *BerRGK* 58: 447-604.
- Schnurr, C. 1992. "The *lex Julia theatralis* of Augustus: some remarks on seating problems in theatre, amphitheatre and circus." *LCM* 17.10:147-160.
- Schürer, E. 1986. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Christ*. G. Vermes et al., trans. Vol. 3, pt. 1. Edinburgh.
- Scodel, R., ed. 1993. *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor.
- Scully, S. 1999. "Orchestra and Stage in Sophocles: *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the Theater of Dionysos." in *Crossing the Stages: The Production, Performance and Reception of Ancient Theater*. J. Porter, E. Csapo, C.W. Marshall and R.C. Ketterer, eds. 65-85. Iowa City.
- Sear, F.B. 2006. *Roman Theatres: an architectural study*. Oxford.
- , 1996. "The South Theatre at Jarash, 1994 campaign." *ADAJ* 40:217-230.
- , 1990. "Vitruvius and Roman Theater Design." *AJA* 94:249-258.
- Segal, A. 1995. *Theatres in Roman Palestine and Provincial Arabia*. Leiden.
- Seigne, J. and S. Agusta-Boularot. 2005. "Le théâtre nord de Gerasa/Jerash (Jordanie). Fonctions et chronologie." *Topoi* 12-13. 339-357.
- Shatzman, I. 1975. *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics*. Bruxelles.
- Sherk, R.K. 1991. "The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities III." *ZPE* 88:225-260.
- , 1970. *The Municipal Decrees of the Roman West*. Buffalo.
- Slater, N.W. 2000. *Plautus in Performance: The theatre of the Mind*. Amsterdam.

- , 1992. "Plautine negotiations: the *Poenulus* prologue unpacked." *YCS* 29:131-146.
- Slater, W.J. 1994. "Actors and their status in the Roman theatre in the West." *JRA* 7:364-368.
- Smadja, E. 2005. "Le culte impérial en Afrique." *Pallas* 68:333-349.
- , 1978. "L'inscription du culte impérial dans la cité: l'exemple de Lepcis Magna au début de l'empire." *Dacia* 4:171-186.
- Small, D.B. 1987. "Social correlations to the Greek cavea in the Roman period." in *Roman Architecture in the Greek world*. 85-93. S. Macready and F.H. Thompson, eds. London.
- Spawforth, A.J.S. 1997. "The Early Reception of the Imperial Cult in Athens: Problems and Ambiguities." in *The Romanization of Athens*. M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff, eds. 183-201. Oxford.
- Stein, A. 1927. *Der römische Ritterstand*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Stevenson, G.H. 1939. *Roman Provincial Administration Till the Age of the Antonines*. New York.
- Syme, R. 1988. "The Journeys of Hadrian." *ZPE* 73:159-170.
- Talbert, R.J.A. 1984a. "Augustus and the Senate." *G & R* 31:55-63.
- , 1984b. *The Senate of Imperial Rome*. Princeton.
- Talloon, P., and Waelkens, M. 2004. "Apollo and the Emperors (I). The Material Evidence for the Imperial Cult at Sagalassos." *AncSoc* 34:171-216.
- Tassaux, F. 1999. "Culte Impérial et Milieux Populaires en Gaule, Italie du Nord et Damaltie." *Histria Antiqua* 5:183-191.
- Taylor, L.R. 1969. "Seating Space in the Roman Senate and the Senatores Pedarii." *TAPA* 100:529-582.
- , 1952. "Lucretius on the Roman Theatre." In *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood*, edited by M.E. White, 147-155. Toronto.

- , 1935. "The Sellisternium and the Theatrical Pompa." *CP* 30.2:122-130.
- , 1914. "Augustales, Seviri Augustales, and Seviri: a Chronological Study." *TAPA* 45:231-253.
- Ted'A (Taller Escola d'Arqueologia). 1989. "El foro provincial de Tarraco, un complejo arquitectónico de época Flavia." *ArchEspArq* 62:141-191.
- Thompson, F.H. 1976. "The Excavation of the Roman Amphitheatre at Chester." in *Miscellaneous Tracts relating to Antiquity*. 105:127-239.
- Torelli, M. 1971. "Le Curiae di Leptis Magna." *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia* 6:105-111.
- Trebilco, P.R. 1991. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
- Treggiari, S. 2002. *Roman Social History*. London.
- , 1991. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges From the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford.
- Trillmich, W. 1996. "Los tres foros de Augusta Emerita y el caso de Corduba." in *Colonia Patricia Corduba: una reflexion arqueológica*. 175-195. Seville.
- , 1993. "Novedades en torno al programa iconografía del teatro romano de Mérida." in *Actas de la I reunion sobre escultura romana en Hispania*, T.N. Basarrate, ed. 113-118. Mérida.
- , 1989-1990. "Un sacrarium del culto imperial en el teatro de Mérida." *Anas* 2-3:87-102.
- Tsontchev, D. 1947. *Contributions à l'histoire du stade antique de Philippopolis*. Sofia.
- Tudor, D. 1962. "Le organizzazioni degli Augustales in Dacia." *Dacia* 6:199-214.
- Valmin, N. 1939. *Fouilles de Delphes. Tome III Epigraphie. Fascicule VI Les Inscriptions du Théâtre*. Paris.
- van Berchem, D. 1941-42. "Les 'clients' de la plèbe romaine." *RendPontAcc* 18:183-190.

- , 1936. "Tessères ou calculi? Essai d'interprétation des jetons romains en plomb." *RN* 39:297-315.
- van Bremen, R. 1985. "Women and Wealth." in *Images of Women in Antiquity*. A. Cameron and A. Kurt, eds. 223-242. Detroit.
- van Nijf, O. 2001. "Local heroes: athletics, festivals and elite self-fashioning in the Roman East." in *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of the Empire*. S. Goldhill, ed. 306-334. Cambridge.
- , 2000. "Inscriptions and Civic Memory in the Roman East." in *The Afterlife of Inscriptions. Reusing, Rediscovering, Reinventing & Revitalizing Ancient Inscriptions*. A.E. Cooley, ed. 21-36. London.
- , 1997. *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Amsterdam.
- Ventura Villanueva, A. 1999. "El teatro en el contexto urbano de colonia Patricia (Córdoba): ambiente epigráfica, evergetos y culto imperial." *AespA* 72:55-72.
- Ville, G. 1981. *La gladiature en Occident des origines à la mort de Domitien*. Rome.
- Vismara, C. and M. Letizia Caldelli. 2000. *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'occidente romano. V. Alpes Maritimae, Gallia Narbonensis, Tres Galliae, Germaniae, Britannia*. Rome.
- Virlouvet, C. 2004. "Les naviculaires d'Arles. À propos de l'inscription provenant de Beyrouth." *MEFRA* 116.1:327-370.
- Webster, J. 1997. "A negotiated syncretism: readings on the development of Romano-Celtic religion." in *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism. Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*. [JRA Supplementary Series no. 23] . D.J. Mattingly, ed. 165-184. Portsmouth.
- Welch, K. 1998. "Greek Stadia and Roman Spectacles. Asia, Athens, and the Tomb of Herodes Atticus." *JRA* 11:117-145.
- , 1994. "The Roman Arena in Late-Republican Italy: A New Interpretation." *JRA* 7:59-80.
- , 1991. "Roman Amphitheatres Revived." *JRA* 4:272-281.

- Whittaker, C.R. 1964. "The Revolt of Papyrius Dionysius." *Historia* 13:348-69.
- Wiedemann, T.E.J. 1995. *Emperors and Gladiators*. London.
- Wiegels, R. 2000. *Lopodunum II. Inschriften und Kultdenkmäler aus dem römischen Ladenburg am Neckar*. Stuttgart.
- Wilson, N. 1982. "Two Observations on Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*." *GRBS* 23:157-163.
- Winkler, J.J. 1985. "The Ephebes' Song: Tragoidia and Polis." *Representations* 11:26-62.
- Winspear, A.D. and L.K. Geweke. 1935. *Augustus and the Reconstruction of Roman Government and Society*. New York.
- Wiseman, J. 1984. "A Distinguished Macedonian Family of the Roman Imperial Period." *AJA* 88.4:567-582.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1973. Review of *Publicans and Sinners: Private Enterprise in the Service of the Roman Republic*, by E. Badian. *Phoenix* 27:189-198.
- , 1971. *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C. - A.D. 14*. Oxford.
- , 1970. "The Definition of 'Eques Romanus' in the Late Republic and Early Empire." *Historia* 19:67-83.
- Wladyslaw, K. and E. Makowiecka. 1973. "Polish Excavation at Kom El Dikka 1965-1966. Preliminary Report." *ASAE* 61:93-124.
- Wörle, M. 1988. *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*. Munich.
- Zanker, P. 1998. *Pompeii. Public and Private Life*. D.L. Schneider, trans. Cambridge, Mass.
- Zevi, F. 2000. "The epigraphic evidence." in *The Sacellum of the Augustaes at Miseno*. P. Miniero, ed. Naples.