

Notes on the Agonistic Institutions of Roman Corinth

Daniel J. Geagan

THE INSCRIPTIONS OF CORINTH as published by John Harvey Kent¹ have brought to light a certain amount of new information on the agonistic institutions, particularly the liturgical aspects, of Roman Corinth. Kent's primary goal of presenting the sources and minimizing the commentary prevented the thorough analysis which the documents deserve. The author's review of Kent's book² did not contain any of this material, partially because of the limitations of time and space and partially because much of the material is better presented in a separate study.

The *agonothesia* was one of the most burdensome liturgies in a Greek city during the period of Roman hegemony. In the western Roman colonies the expenses of games were borne by the magistrates.³ In the Greek cities, on the other hand, a liturgist entitled the *agonothetes* paid for and managed the contests, and for so doing gained the right to include the *agonothesia* in his *cursus honorum*. One would expect that the system prevalent in other Roman colonies was in use also at Corinth, and this fact may well explain the paucity of information about the civic agonistic institutions and the absence of *agonothetai* for games other than the Isthmia. But Corinth was peculiar in that besides civic games the traditional Isthmian games, conducted in accordance with Greek customs, also were under its control. The

¹ *Corinth VIII.3, The Inscriptions 1926-1950* (Princeton 1966), hereafter cited merely as KENT. So also A. B. West, *Corinth VIII.2, Latin Inscriptions 1896-1926* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1931) and B. D. Meritt, *Corinth VIII.1, Greek Inscriptions 1896-1927* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1931) will be cited merely as WEST and MERITT. Unless otherwise indicated, numerals following these citations refer to the inscriptions as numbered in these collections.

² *AJA* 71 (1967) 422-24.

³ *Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae s. Ursonensis*, ch. 70, 71, 128, although the right to give games was not limited to the magistrates, ch. 126. See the texts of S. Riccobono in *Fontes Iuris Romani Antejustiniani*, I: *Leges* (Florence 1941) 177-98 and of A. d'Ors, *Epigrafia Jurídica de la España romana* (Madrid 1953) 167-280. Hugh Mason has recalled the passage in *Apul. Met.* 10.18 describing Thiasus' promise of *munera* for the quinquennial magistracy at Corinth.

records of the *agonothesai* are preserved in the honorary inscriptions, and many observations can be made.⁴

The contests conducted on the Greek system at Corinth were three: (1) the Isthmia and Caesarea, (2) the imperial contests named for the ruling emperor (Kent p.28), and (3) the Asklepieia. The former two were celebrated at the Isthmian sanctuary and were the principal games at Corinth.

Kent suggested that the *agonothetes* was probably elected by the Corinthian city council because the *ornamenta* of the *agonothetes* could be awarded by a vote of this council, but he neglected to note that the duoviral and aedilician also were awarded by decree of the council, although these offices were elective.⁵ Whether or not the council actually selected the *agonothetes*, it is likely that it was very influential in the choice, and it is possible that it may have had to stand surety for the expenses of the *munera*. Kent has already remarked on the great prestige of the *agonothetes*.⁶ He also observed that the *agonothetes* was expected to contribute personally to the expenses of the festival. Indeed the nature of such a liturgy and the reason for the great prestige was the fact that the *agonothetes* financed the festival almost completely. This fact probably explains the cases of shared *agonothesai*.⁷

At Athens⁸ it was not uncommon for an *agonothetes* to undertake some public work in conjunction with his service. One inscription from the first century B.C. indicates a similar benefaction at the Isthmia (Kent 153), although this was on the special occasion of the first games to be offered after the return of the Isthmia to Corinthian control. This *agonothetes* instituted new contests, restored the buildings of the Caesarea, and gave banquets to all of the colonists,⁹ as well as

⁴ For other commentaries on the agonistic institutions at Corinth see Kent pp.28-31, who includes a list of the known *agonothetai*, and West *passim*. In many instances the conclusions of both West and Kent have been incorporated into this discussion.

⁵ Duoviral *ornamenta* were awarded by decree of the *decuriones* at Corinth; see Kent 152, 167, 168, West 105; so also the *ornamenta* of the *aedilis*, Kent 152, West 107. The evidence for these offices being elective must be sought outside Corinth. The *Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae s. Ursonensis* indicates election in *comitia*, ch. 101; ch. 132 regulates election expenses. The *Lex municipii Malacitani* (Riccobono, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.3] 208-19, and d'Ors, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.3] 311-41) ch. 51-54, gives explicit instructions on methods of election through *comitia*.

⁶ The *ornamenta* of the *agonothesia* could be listed in a *cursus* either before or after those of the *quinquennalis* (see *infra* n.30).

⁷ Kent 212 and *Hesperia* 28 (1959) no. 5, pp.324-26.

⁸ For the Athenian *agonothesia* under the Roman empire see D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*, *Hesperia* Suppl. 12 (1967) 132-36.

⁹ At Athens the wealthy Herodes Atticus was accustomed to regale the populace with feasts, Philostratos, *Vit.Soph.* 2.1, p.235 Kayser.

one other service the description of which is now lost. In return for his financial support the *agonothetes* received the privilege of managing the festival, even to the point of adding new contests (Kent 153) and possibly altering the sequence (Kent 154 and West 81). His name was used for the eponymous dating of victor lists,¹⁰ and from these we may conclude that for the Isthmian sanctuary he was the eponymous official, although the *duoviri* filled this function in the city. The *agonothesia* entitled its holder to honors not only in the sanctuary but also in the city. In conducting the games his authority extended even to the housing of visiting athletes (Kent 306).

The same man seems always to have coupled the *agonothesiai* of the Isthmia and Caesarea, although they were separate contests.¹¹ The only exceptions¹² to the use of the terminology 'the Isthmia and Caesarea' are West 68 (mid-first century after Christ), where C. Julius Spartiaticus was titled *agonothetes* of the "*Isthmion·et·Caesa·Sebasteon*," and Meritt 80 and 81, where Cn. Cornelius Pulcher was called 'agonothetes of the Caesarea Isthmia', although a dedication from Epidaurus (IG IV 795) gives the more standard version. The *agonothesia* for this pair of contests is attested from the opening years of the first century after Christ through A.D. 181, and possibly the reign of Gordian (Kent pp.30–31). The institution of the Caesarea at Isthmia predated the restoration of the games to Corinthian control (Kent 153).

There is only one document recording an *agonothesia* of the imperial games which does not also include that of the Isthmia and Caesarea (Kent 138), although other *cursus* of the same man do include both (IG IV 795, West 71). On the other hand, documents recording an *agonothesia* of the Isthmia and Caesarea but not that of the imperial games are common. These circumstances will be discussed below.

The imperial games were named after the current emperor. Those attested include the Tiberea Caesarea Sebastea or Tiberea Augustea Caesarea under Tiberius (Kent 153 and 156), the Tiberea Claudia

¹⁰ Meritt 14, 16, Kent 223. Even at the time when Corinthian civic documents were written in Latin, Greek remained the official language at Isthmia. Thus it continued to be used for the lists of victors; even in Latin documents the Greek genitive plural was merely transliterated when the names of games were recorded.

¹¹ Kent 154, West 81, and the separate lists of victors, Meritt 15, 19. For the history of the Caesarea see West pp.64, 65.

¹² With regard to Kent 173 see *infra* p.77 and Kent 212, p.73.

Caesarea Sebastea under Claudius (West 82 and 83), the Neronea or Neronea Caesarea¹³ under Nero, the Caesarea Vespasiana Sebastea (Kent 210) under Vespasian, the Caesarea Nervanea Traiana Sebastea (Kent 218, 224, West 71) and after 102 the Caesarea Nervanea Traiana Sebastea Germanica Dacea (IG IV 795, Kent 138, West 72, Meritt 77) honoring Trajan. These games do not continue into the reign of Hadrian, an emperor extremely popular elsewhere in the east. Possibly the foundation of the Panhellenia and the consequent shifting of the center of Greek religious life from Corinth to Athens caused this.¹⁴

Kent has remarked that the Greater Isthmia, which occurred every fourth year, were made up of the Isthmia and Caesarea (p.28). He adds that within half a century after the return of the Isthmia to the control of Corinth, the imperial contests were added to the Greater Isthmia. It will be necessary to reexamine the evidence.

The inscriptions may be divided into four groups. The first includes those honoring men who had been *agonothetai* not only of the Isthmia and Caesarea but also of the imperial contests. The earliest example is Kent 153, which cites the *agonothesia* of the Isthmia and Caesarea of the year 6 or 2 B.C., when the games were first celebrated under the newly restored Corinthian control. The man honored did not serve in the imperial games until sometime in the reign of Tiberius. The other examples occur in the reigns of Nero (Kent 158–163, West 86–90), Vespasian (Kent 210), and Trajan (IG IV 795, Meritt 77, West 71, 72, Kent 224).¹⁵ Kent 216 cannot be dated, and Kent 230, dated to the second quarter of the third century on the basis of letter forms, clearly separates the Caesarea and the Sebastea from the Isthmia and the Caesarea (restored).

The second group is composed of honors for those who had been *isagogeis* of the imperial contests and *agonothetai* of the Isthmia and the

¹³ Kent 158–163, West 86–90, all commemorating Tiberius Claudius Dinippus, whose importance at Corinth at this time must have paralleled that of Tiberius Claudius Novius at Athens, see Geagan, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 134–35; Kent 208, 209 (restored).

¹⁴ This connection is based on a suggestion of J. H. Oliver *per litteras*. There were also contests called the Caesarea Sebastea: Kent 213, 230, and possibly 216, West 68. The last can be dated to the reign of Claudius. The others have been dated variously on the basis of letter forms. Kent 230 has the conjunction and the definite article before each word and may indicate something a bit different, especially in view of the late date assigned to it by Kent.

¹⁵ But see pp.79–80 *infra*.

Caesarea. The *isagogeiai* are attested for games under Tiberius (Kent 156) and Trajan (Kent 218).¹⁶ Of two other inscriptions, in one case the games to which the *isagogeia* pertained are not named (Kent 212), and in the other the games are called merely the Caesarea Sebastea (Kent 213).

The third group includes those who were merely *agonothetai* of the Isthmia and Caesarea. The first of these occurs under Augustus (Kent 150), two under Tiberius (Kent 154 and West 81), and one under Claudius (West 67), while two others are not dated (Kent 198 and 222). The fourth group honors those who were *isagogeis* of the imperial contests but never filled an *agonothesia*. Three of these occurred during the reign of Claudius (West 82, 83, Kent 173),¹⁷ and one in the reign of Nero (Kent 208).

The imperial contests are attested as early as Tiberius. In later years one *agonothetes* of the Isthmia and Caesarea alone is attested to the reign of Claudius, and another had already served as *isagogeus*, a lesser distinction, under Trajan. If we suppose that the imperial contests, when they were introduced, were introduced in conjunction with the 'Greater Isthmia', composed of the Isthmia and Caesarea, how can we account for the continued occurrence of the Isthmia and Caesarea without reference to the imperial contests? May not the Isthmia and Caesarea have constituted the 'Lesser Isthmia' from that time? Indeed there is no certain reference to the Isthmia alone (*i.e.* the Lesser Isthmia according to Kent's scheme) during the whole Roman period except Kent 212 of the late first century after Christ, and this is peculiar because of the shared *agonothesia*.¹⁸

It is clear that the imperial contests were introduced under Tiberius at the latest. Can a more definite occasion be suggested for this event? Kent 153 honors a man who first produced the Isthmia after they had

¹⁶ See *infra*, p.74.

¹⁷ See *infra* p.77.

¹⁸ This is not the only example of a shared *agonothesia*. A metrical statue base in honor of Nikias (O. Broneer, *Hesperia* 28 [1959] no. 5, pp.324-26) was erected by the *synagonothetai*. This coupled with Kent 212 suggests a multiplicity of *agonothetai*. On the other hand there is the evidence of the eponymity of the *agonothetes* at the Isthmia and the fact that these are the only two sources indicating a multiple *agonothesia*; all of the other sources indicate a single *agonothetes* for all of the Isthmian contests (see *infra* n.19). The answer to the problem is probably to be found in the fact that the men most likely to merit a dedication were sufficiently wealthy to bear the burden of a whole year, while in many years two or more less distinguished citizens might band together to share the burden. Although there might have been a multiplicity of *agonothetai*, they probably served a single *agonothesia*.

returned to Corinthian control, and in so doing mounted a memorable festival. Apparently later he served as *agonothetes* of the imperial contests under Tiberius but without being *agonothetes* also of the Isthmia and Caesarea in the same year. This is the only attested instance of this occurrence.¹⁹ May not the Corinthians have conferred the same honor of initiating a festival on the same man in expectation of a second festival as memorable as the first?

In the imperial contests the *agonothetes* was assisted by an *isagogeus*,²⁰ who might go on to become *agonothetes* of the Isthmia and Caesarea, but not of the imperial contests. Among the preserved documents honoring *isagogeis*, in only two cases is the dedicator's identity preserved, in Kent 173 his wife (restored), and in Kent 156 the *hieromnemes* of the Caesarea. In neither case does the dedication appear to have been made solely because of the *isagogeia*. Kent has already recognized that the proper name of this official was 'the *isagogeus* of the *agonothetes* so and so' (p.30 n.32). The genitive case of the name of the *agonothetes* would seem to occur in several additional instances unnoticed by Kent.²¹ In possibly two instances the *isagogeus* was a member of the same family as the *agonothetes*.²²

Before I discuss certain other officials of the Isthmian games, a few final remarks must be made regarding the *agonothesia*. The number of times a man might serve was not restricted. Antonius Sospis served three times (Kent 226). There is evidence of multiple *agonothetai*, although there would seem to have been a single *agonothesia* (see n.18

¹⁹ The evidence for this conclusion is fragmentary. First, there is the fact that the *agonothetes* of the imperial contests always also had the *agonothesia* of the 'Isthmia and Caesarea' in his *cursus*. Second, the *agonothetes* appears to have been the eponymous magistrate of the Isthmian sanctuary, implying a single annual officer. Third, there are the texts themselves. The usual formula uses the word *agonothetes* only once when referring both to the imperial contests and to the Isthmia and Caesarea (Kent 210, 158–163; West 86–90, 71 [restored] and 72 [restored]). On a single occasion (Kent 153) the word is repeated, but this is because the *agonothesia* of the imperial contests and of the Isthmia and Caesarea were served in different years. In IG IV 795 the title appears once for the imperial contests and the Isthmia and Caesarea and a second time for the Asklepieia. The restorations of Kent 218 (see p.72 *supra*) and 224 (see pp.79–80 *infra*) could be faulty. West 71 presents a problem, but again the restoration may be at fault. Kent 230 is late and is strange in other respects (see p.72 *supra* and n.14).

²⁰ On the *isagogeus* see L. Robert, *REG* 79 (1966) 738–39.

²¹ Kent 173, 209, 213, 214, West 84 (see pp.77–79 *infra*); Kent 208 and West 83 also ought to be restored to conform.

²² West 82 and 84 (see p.78 *infra*). In the former the father of the *isagogeus* and later *agonothetes* is honored, while in the latter the son is honored. It is also possible to restore a relative in Kent 208 and 209 (see p.79 *infra*), although it is not certain.

supra). One inscription referring to the *agonothesia* (Kent 224) can be better restored, and even so improved is not beyond suspicion (see pp.79–80 *infra*). The portion of the restored *cursus* in Kent 170 is not completely convincing. Finally a third *agonothesia* appears in the sources—that of the Sebastea and Asklepieia (IG IV 795, West 71, Kent 230). Although this festival also appears to have followed the Greek liturgical system rather than the Roman, it need not be connected with the Isthmia. A single metrical inscription refers to the *athlothetai*.²³ Broneer suggested associating them with the *Hellano-dikai*, “who would have been responsible for distributing the prizes.” It is also possible and more probable that the *agonothetai* are referred to in a poetic form.²⁴

There is evidence for an *agoranomia* of the Isthmian festival. There is no certain instance of the title *agoranomos* being applied to a civic official or magistrate of Roman Corinth. Although the title *aedilis* is rendered *agoranomos* elsewhere, the only possible equivalent found at Corinth is *oikonomos* (Romans 16.23).²⁵ Only three epigraphical references to the *agoranomia* or to an *agoranomos* are preserved from Roman Corinth. A dedication (SEG XI 50) indicated that “Cn. Pompeius Zenas dedicated to Dionysos a tenth part (?) when he was *agoranomos* of Zeus.” The *agoranomos* cited in Kent 308 clearly belongs to a religious organization, for which this stone contains a fragment of the statutes. The third (IG IV 203) relates the benefactions of P. Licinius Priscus to the Isthmian sanctuary. Lines 23–27 indicate that “the same man built the stoa next to the stadium with its vaulted chambers and adornments *for the sake of the agoranomia*” (*italics mine*). It is only logical to conclude that such gifts to the Isthmian sanctuary would have been connected with an office held there.²⁶ Thus this *agoranomia* was a traditional Greek office and not the Roman aedileship. The construction of a stoa coincides well with the duties of a man charged with the good order of the *panegyris*, including the sheltering of the huge

²³ *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 324–26.

²⁴ Again the suggestion of Broneer, *per litteras*.

²⁵ J. H. Oliver writes that the *oikonomos* is a minor treasury official, and not the *aedilis*. The Confraternity Edition translates it ‘city treasurer’. There was an *οικονόμος* of the *κοινὸν Ἀσίας*. Thessalonica, another colony, had an *οικονόμος τῆς πόλεως* (S. Pelekidis, *Ἀπὸ τὴν πολιτεία καὶ τὴν κοινωνία τῆς ἀρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης* (Salonica 1934) 84 n.5.

²⁶ On *agoranomoi* for *panegyreis* and festivals see L. Robert, *Gnomon* 35 (1963) 68–69. Kent’s volume contains another inscription (306) already published by Broneer, *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 181–90, which appears to have been an imperial rescript regarding Priscus’ projects.

crowds and the supervision of the multitude of vendors and food merchants.²⁷

There also was a *pyrophoros* of the Isthmia; he could be a child, and this was an early office in a liturgical *cursus honorum*. Two references are preserved for the Isthmia (Kent 212, 214), and in both *cursus* a service as *isagogeus* is also preserved, although the sequence differs in each. His duties involved the bearing of the sacred fire.²⁸

Two dedications were set up by the *hieromnemes*. West (on 81, p.66) knew only one of these, and he assumed that they belonged to the pre-Roman institutions, since they were foreign to the Roman administrative traditions. Further he viewed them as priests of Poseidon. An inscription published by Kent (156) gives the title *hieromnemo[nes] Caesareon*. It would appear then, contrary to Kent's conclusion that they supervised the Isthmian sanctuary, that they were connected with the supervision of the Caesarea. In the light of the new document, it becomes clear that West 81 was set up by the *hieromnemes* specifically because T. Manlius Iuvencus "first presented the Caesarea before the Isthmia."

Finally there were the *Hellanodikai*.²⁹ Such a board existed at Corinth from A.D. 3 at the latest and is attested as late as the second century after Christ (Meritt 15, 16, Kent 223, possibly 228). They are cited at the Isthmia only in the headings of victor lists, and their number seems to have been a constant ten.

As was the case with those of the civic magistracies, the *ornamenta* of the *agonothetes* could be awarded by the Corinthian *boulē*. In prestige the agonothetic *ornamenta* outranked the duoviral, but not always the quinquennial duoviral.³⁰

APPENDIX

Unless it is specified otherwise the author has examined each of the stones discussed below.

²⁷ See also L. Robert, *Hellenica* I (1940) 49, and D. Geagan, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 24, where the Athenian hoplite general is praised for performing agoranomic functions at the Eleusinian festival. For a Hellenistic example of civic *agoranomoi* (in the Peiraeus) caring for the good order during a religious procession see *IG II²* 380 (= *SIG³* 313).

²⁸ See L. Robert, *REG* 79 (1966) 746-48.

²⁹ See L. Robert, *Hellenica* V (1948) 59-63, and *REG* 79 (1966) 749 n.1.

³⁰ West 105 and Kent 166 place the agonothetic between the duoviral and the quinquennial. Kent 168, 182, and probably 185 place the agonothetic last.

KENT 173

Kent's text of 173 reads (transcribed according to the Leyden conventions):

 [isagogi · -- · Cor]neli
 [Pulchri · agonoth]et Is
 [thm · Caesareon ·] Sebasteon
 [aedilicib · et · II · v]iralib · et ·
 5 [quinquennialib ·] ornament
 [is · honorat]o
 [-----]ina
 [uxor · eius · post · ob]itum

Kent remarked, "I have assumed that in line 2 the letters IS follow an abbreviation, despite the fact that there is no punctuation mark before them, and belong to the word *Is[thm(ion)]*; the only alternative is to assume a misspelling of some form of the word *agonothetes*." Not only is there no punctuation before IS, but there is not even a space. Kent's assumption leads to another difficulty: this would be the only instance of games entitled the *Isthmia Caesarea Sebastea*. The genitive case of Cornelius, as Kent correctly observes, indicates that the man being honored was *isagogeus*, and a genitive case of *agonothetes* is needed. Unfortunately because of the frequent use of abbreviations there are few examples of the oblique cases of Greek first declension masculine nouns transliterated into Latin. Those preserved from Corinth are all in the dative case,³¹ and all are merely transliterations of the Greek dative case. Leumann-Hofmann³² recognizes that such Greek words could be taken over into Latin in the nominative, and then declined according to the rules of the Latin third declension. Thus [*agonoth*]etis could be a perfectly valid genitive case. Unfortunately I have been unable to find epigraphical examples either at Corinth or elsewhere, but support might be found in Kent 214 (*infra*).

At the beginning of line 7 there is a lunate trace, probably either of a B or a P or an R. Because of the manner of break near the bottom of the letter, a B would appear the most likely.

³¹ *Agonothete*: Kent 153, 162, 218, West 86, 87, 88, 68; *irenarche*: Kent 195; and *Nem[eo]nice*: West 95.

³² *Lateinische Grammatik I* (Munich 1928, repr. 1963) 262, §182(c)(2).

KENT 214

Kent's text of 214 reads:

[-----]
 [pyr]oph[or · Caesa]reon · et
 [Is]thmion · ago[-----]s
 3 [· A]rrunti · Mosch[i · isagog ·]
 [----- i]bus · o[rnamentis]
 [-----]

The second line clearly contains some case of the word *agonothetes*, and the context of line 3 demands a genitive to agree with the name of Arruntius Moschus. Again the genitive form *ago[notheti]s* would suit the context and spacing. In line 3, the H of *Mosch[i]* ought to be dotted. There is a trace of a punctuation after the final S of line 2, and it ought not to be restored at the beginning of line 3.

WEST 82 AND 84

These two documents can be used for cross-restoration.

WEST 84:

[L · Rutilio · L · f ·]
 Aem [Fusco patri]
 3 isagog[ei · C · Rutili · L · f ·]
 Fusci · a[gonothetis]
 Isthm[ion · et · Caesareon]
 [-----]

West's restorations: line 3 *isagog[i -- Rutili]*; line 4 *A[(?)gonothetae]*; line 5 *isthm[ion -----]*.

WEST 82 (*non vidi*):

C · Rutilio · L · f
 Aem Fusco isagogi
 3 Tibereon Claudieon
 Cae[s]a[reon Seba]steon
 [agonothetis L] Rutili
 6 L · f · [Aem Fusci p]atriis

West's restorations: line 4 as it stands; line 5 *[agonothetae L] Rutili*.

KENT 213

Kent's text of 213 reads:

[-----]
 [----]li · f
 [Ae]m Pa[. . . .]mamae
 3 [so]dali · Augustal · Isa[gog ·]
 [Ca]esareon · [S]ebaste[on]
 [· et · agonothe]t · Caesa[reon ·]
 6 [----]tae · M[-----]
 [----]e · Au[-----]
 [-----]s · Liv[---]
 [-----]

Lines 5 and 6 ought to read:

[· Isthm]iōn [· e]t · Caesa[reon]
 [agonothe]tae · M[-----]

Leumann-Hofmann³³ also recognizes the declension of Greek nouns in *-ης* transliterated into Latin as first declension nouns. I have found no Corinthian examples, but the grammatical index to Dessau (III.2, p.852) offers several from elsewhere.

KENT 209

This would appear to be a dedication to the *isagogeus* of the same person who was honored in Kent 208. The wording is not precisely identical, but line 5 might be restored as follows (assuming that Pudicius was a variant for Puticius):

[agonothet · M ·] Pud[ici -----]

Puticius was both *isagogeus* (Kent 208) and later *agonothetes* of the Isthmia and Caesarea (see p.74 *supra*).

KENT 224

Kent's text of 224 is unsatisfactory. It reads as follows:

M · Antonio ·
 M · f · [A]em · [A]chaico ·
 [agonothete · Ca]esareon

³³ *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.32), and n.28 *supra*.

[Nervaneon · Traianeon · et ·]
 5 [agonothete · Isthmio]η · ετ ·
 [Caesareon --- A]ntoni · Tauri ·
 [- - - - - de]curionalib ·
 [- - - - - ornam]entis
 [ornato · d · d · post ·] obitum ·
 10 [- - - - - a]micus · et ·
 [- - - - -]tes
 [- - - - -]

The following difficulties are unresolved. A lightly inscribed but unmistakable vertical hasta appears after the punctuation in line 2. It would appear that the mason had begun a word belonging in the next line, then dressed down the surface of the stone to erase it. The traces resemble those of a P, suggesting the word *pyrophoros*. Second, the genitive case of the name of Antonius Taurus is unexplained. In the light of the evidence available this could be a case of his being an *agonothetes* during the *isagogeia* of the man being honored, or, as in Kent 212, a case of a *conagonothesia*. Third, in a case where the *agonothesia* of the imperial games and of the Isthmia and Caesarea is cited, the word *agonothetes* ought not to be repeated (see *supra* n.19). A satisfactory reconstruction is still needed. Kent neglected to mention that the punctuation at the end of line 11 is in the form of a large lunate stroke opening toward the left and extending from the center of the line to a point below the bottom of the line.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
 September, 1967