Worth a thousand words: A new approach to the development of monumental inscriptions at Ephesus during the early Imperial period

Epigraphy and its audience

Recent studies have called for a greater analysis of an inscription’s monumental role as symbol and image “directed to the eye rather than the ear of the observer”. This movement towards the study of an “epigraphic culture” places greater emphasis on an inscription’s monumental aspects, such as urban and epigraphic contexts, appearance and visibility. Studies on literacy and bilingualism have also shown the power of a text as symbol, which could be read by all members of the ancient audience. With estimated literacy rates between only 5-10%, the significance of an inscription to the ancient viewer would have derived from its physical appearance at least as much as its grammatical
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context. Indeed the vital importance of an inscription’s visibility and appearance in an urban context is attested in several inscriptions themselves, which stipulate that they must be placed in a location where they can be seen, not, as one might suspect, read. Ongoing studies of the carving process for Roman inscriptions by stone masons such as Richard Grasby have demonstrated the considerable time and effort involved in the planning and execution of an inscription’s ordinatio, lending further significance to its physical appearance and layout.

While the fundamental importance in assessing and understanding the monumentality of inscriptions has become an integral part of scholarship for epigraphers, ancient historians and archaeologists alike, a basic methodology for assessing the monumental aspects of an inscription has not been universally defined. The primary aims of this study are to propose a set of criteria for evaluating an inscription’s monumental appearance and to explore the ways in which this approach can inform our understanding of inscriptions, especially from the perspective of the viewer. One possible reason for the apparent lacuna in scholarship is the difficulty that, until quite recently, persisted in accessing images of epigraphic texts. Replication of images was prohibitively expensive even for the most prominent and well-funded academic publications, and many published images of inscriptions were not reproduced in high quality, which did little to foster scholarship on their monumental appearance. To make this observation is not to undermine 20th century epigraphic scholarship; on the contrary it is impressive that so much has been achieved despite the technological adversities which the discipline faced. Nonetheless,

---

4 Figure of 10% is taken from Bodel, J. (2001), 15.
5 Bodel, 2001, 9. Many larger documents (e.g. Salutaris’ foundation, Augustus’ Res Gestae) and bronze tablets in Rome, which would have been challenging for the reader at the best of times, have also suggested the importance of inscriptions as images (Williamson 1987, 160-83, Bodel 2001, 25-30 and Trimble, J. (2007) ‘Visibility and Viewing on the Severan Marble Plan’ in Swain et al; Severan Culture, 368-84.
7 Primary epigraphic reference materials such as CIL, which has reunited text and image since their new supplementary volume of imperial inscriptions from the city of Rome in 1996, did not provide images up until this point. IvE, which is cited throughout this work, also makes sparing use of images (save IvE1), indubitably on account of cost. Moreover, collections such as FiE which contain drawings and photographs are costly folios, which are not widely available. It is in the nature of a large monumental inscription, such as Salutaris’ foundation to lose a great deal of its message when it is compressed to an image about 8 x 10 cm as it is Rogers’ publication. Similar problems are evident in volumes such as MAMA VIII, where thumbnail images of inscriptions make conclusive study difficult, if not impossible.
the aforementioned limitations in the presentation and publication of research constitute considerable obstacles in assessing the visual and monumental aspects of inscriptions.

Over the past decade, however, innovations in technology, such as digital photography, the creation of on-line epigraphic databases and the evolution of an international standard of publication have revolutionized the ways in which scholars from numerous fields can access and interact with inscriptions. These large and painstakingly compiled resources represent crucial efforts to mitigate the aforementioned obstacles in assessing monumental appearance and create an unprecedented opportunity in which one can access, from anywhere in the world, high quality images of original inscriptions, often accompanied by translations and information on their immediate location within the urban context. The next logical step for scholars is to define a methodology which will demonstrate how to utilise these new resources. One of the many advantages provided by these new media is the ability to observe changes in the appearance and representation of inscriptions in a given community. This aspect of monumental inscriptions, which would have been most evident to the ancient audience, will be the focus of the discussion.

**Criteria for assessing monumentality**

The primary factors under consideration for an inscription’s monumental appearance include aspects of its physical appearance such as the organisation of the text on the stone, the use of decoration, punctuation, abbreviations and letter sizes, as well as use of the architectural space. This study will explore, where relevant, the choice of monumental language in some bilingual inscriptions as well as the monumental implications of *damnatio memoriae* on the appearance of an inscription. The city of Ephesus has been chosen, not only because it is exceptionally well documented, benefiting from over a century of meticulous publication and restoration by the Austrian

---

8 Examples of databases include Oxford’s CSAD website ([www.csad.ox.ac.uk](http://www.csad.ox.ac.uk)), especially collection of the Vindolanda tablets, Heidelberg website ([www.epigraphische-datenbank-heidelberg.de](http://www.epigraphische-datenbank-heidelberg.de)) with over 14,000 texts, and C. Roueché’s forthcoming INSAPH publication ([http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk](http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk)), to name a few.

9 This topic is worthy of an independent study in its own right. A comprehensive exploration on the practice of *damnatio memoriae* at Ephesus, to which these discussions offer a brief introduction, is currently in preparation by the author.
team,¹⁰ but also because it contains numerous bilingual inscriptions, thus offering a unique opportunity to see the development of Greek monumental language beside the image of Latin inscriptions in the urban context.

The criteria for assessing monumental inscriptions are more difficult to use than they are to define, primarily because not all inscriptions will feature all the aspects which are set forth below. Such absences largely explain why not all of the criteria below are expressly discussed in relation to every inscription. The criteria for assessing the monumentality of an inscription are set out below in two groups: the first group addresses factors in the appearance of the inscription itself and can be used with any monumental inscription, regardless of whether its context is known; while the second set of criteria, which includes elements from the monumental context, applies more specifically to sites, such as Ephesus, where further contextual information is available. Each of these factors affects the way the text appeared to the viewer as well as its readability as a monument, which can be lost in a purely textual translation. These aspects of an inscription are more representative of how the text was viewed – and intended to be viewed – by the ancient audience, than a study of the text alone will reveal.

Appearance of the text free of context

- The arrangement of the text on the stone: use of spaces, line breaks and/or indentations separate parts of the text (dedicator, recipient, object dedicated);
- The use of punctuation (stop marks) or decorations (leaves or arabesques) in the inscription to highlight names, numbers or offices or sections of the text;
- Appearance of letters: letter size, choice of medium (carved, painted, bronze);
- Use of language (Greek, or Latin and Greek);
- Use of formula/word order: hierarchy of representation and the associations drawn by the relative positions of the names.

¹⁰The context of an inscription was often lost and the ability to associate dedications with surviving structures or to recreate the monumental landscape is now often limited. Thus, it is simply not possible to employ this methodology to every inscription. However, this limitation of the evidence only underlines the importance of utilising such materials when it is possible to do so.
Appearance of the text in context

- Arrangement of the text in the architectural space: the positioning of the inscription within the architecture of the building or monument of which it forms part;
- Readability of the text in the monumental space: lighting, shadows, height;
- Comparison within the monument: associations with other texts and statues;
- Comparison with adjacent monuments in the urban context.

The analysis of Ephesian inscriptions is divided into two parts. The first part is an in-depth study of three adjacent and well preserved monumental dedications in Ephesus at the South Gate of the Tetragonos Agora (Map 2 no. 56): the Arch of Mazeus and Mithridates, the East Hall (often called ‘Nero’s Hall’) and the Library of Celsus (Map 2, nos. 56, 62 and 55 respectively). These monuments, each separated by about 50 years, demonstrate numerous changes in the development of Greek monumental writing from the dawn of the first century to the first quarter of the second century AD. All three monuments feature bilingual inscriptions, which allow a comparison of Greek and Latin traditions of monumentality. The well preserved state of the inscriptions and the urban context offer a rare opportunity to examine not only a dedication but the larger monumental context in which these inscriptions would have been seen by the ancient audience. As such, this section is perhaps the most persuasive and illustrative of the benefits inherent in the new methodology. The second section will examine dedications from two different areas of the city where the urban context is less well preserved: the State Agora and the Theatre (Map 1 nos. 18 and 75). The aim of this section is to demonstrate how the aforementioned methodology can be applied to a larger body of material and to examine the extent to which developments evident at the Tetragonos Agora can be observed in the rest of the city.

This new approach does not seek to criticize any of the current approaches to the publication of inscriptions, nor does it attempt to suggest that many of the fundamental limitations in using inscriptions as a source have been resolved. On the contrary, when

---

11 One should note that the ‘bilingual’ texts at the library of Celsus are two separate equestrian bases placed at each side of the library, one with a dedication in Latin, the other with a similar dedication in Greek.
one examines inscriptions as a visual subject, one often finds contradictions between the message of the text and the message that is conveyed by its appearance on the stone. But, the greater accessibility of images of inscriptions does open new avenues in epigraphy and archaeology which will reinforce the ability of each of these disciplines to inform our understanding of the ancient world. This article, which represents one case study, should therefore be seen as the beginning of an academic discussion rather than a final judgment on the subject.

**Questions of Identity**

The analysis set out in this paper has sought to avoid taking any position in the ongoing debate as to whether and to what extent Roman culture and identity were adopted by or imposed upon local populations in the late republic and early Imperial period. This debate is well-documented elsewhere and addressing the issues it raises is outside the scope of this work. The purpose of this article is to observe developments in the representation of Greek monumental epigraphy, not the cultural influences which may or may not have been motivating factors behind these changes. Of fundamental importance is to appreciate the limitations imposed by epigraphic bias and the role of inscriptions as an ideological statement from which conclusive statements regarding identity are difficult to substantiate. Moreover, to assume that the development in imagery was viewed as quintessentially ‘Greek’ or ‘Roman’ in nature is to miss the larger implications of monuments and the ancient audience in a cosmopolitan community such as Ephesus.

**Part I. The South Gate of the Tetragonos Agora**

The Tetragonos Agora is an ideal example of an urban location at Ephesus since it is one of the few contexts at Ephesus where systematic excavations have been carried out below the Roman level. Although the grid of the Hellenistic city was significantly altered

---


13 Bodel 2001, 46-47.

during the Imperial period, the Tetragonos Agora remained in a strategic urban location in both versions. Roman period development of the Tetragonos Agora connected it to the State Agora, the Harbor and the Marble street as well as a sacred road to the Koressian gate or towards Ortygia. The South Gate, which will be the focus of this study, intersected the Embolos, a vital urban artery between the city’s commercial center and its political center (Maps 1 & 3 no. 36). The most impressive aspect of the Southern Gate and the Lower Embolos, however, is the extent to which it has been reconstructed in situ and with drawings, to represent the urban context as it would have appeared ca. 2nd c. AD. Inscriptions from this site are well documented, though due to the continuous use and construction of this context many are no longer in their original context. The monuments in this context, like the merchants who filled its open spaces, represent a wide social and ethnic background of benefactors including a city founder, an Egyptian princess, a rhetor, two freedmen, an Alexandrian merchant, and a general of the Roman army.

The Arch of Mazeus and Mithridates (ca. 3 BC), The East Hall of the Agora (AD 54-59) and Celsus’ Library (ca. AD 110), show a clear development in the display of Greek public writing and the use of bilingual inscriptions. While the historical context and the benefactors vary significantly, the focus of this study will be the way in which these monumental dedications relate to each other and the progression each demonstrates in the public display of Greek writing, especially in terms of the contrast between Greek and Latin traditions of epigraphy. Recent scholarship on bilingualism, focusing primarily upon linguistics and the use of language as a guide to nuances in identity, religion, economics, and the application of law in the provinces, has offered significant insights into the function, meaning, and use of the term. In examining the appearance of the

---

15 The Hellenistic road from the Harbor was replaced in the Augustan period by a straight road that intersects the Marble street in front of the Theatre (cf. Tafel 81 & 82 from Thur, H., in Freisinger, H. and Krinzinger, F. (eds.), 100 Jahre österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos (Vienna)).
16 Late Archaic and Classical graveyards, which may have served as a precedent for Hellenistic and Roman monuments have been found in this context along the Eastern stoa and the lower Embolos: the Circular monument, Tomb of Arsinoe and Heroon of Androklos (Scherrer, P. ENG, 124-127 and 134-6).
17 Cf. note 3. One of the most authoritative and comprehensive works on the subject, Adams, J.N. (2003) (op.cit. no. 3) examines bilingualism as a concept, rather than a part of visual culture (with sparing use of images throughout its 864 pages). Although images are not always integral to discussion, their exclusion can marginalize a text’s physical attributes, which were arguably, in the case of public monuments, the most prominent aspect of the text.
inscription, this study aims to contribute further, by presenting the message of these inscriptions as they would have been viewed by a broader audience.

To understand the changes that took place in the appearance of public inscriptions in this context, it is first necessary to establish the existing Greek tradition of late Hellenistic inscriptions. While only a handful of Hellenistic inscriptions survived the Roman remodeling of the Tetragonos Agora, one dedication of a waterclock and a ‘parastas’, dating from the mid-first century BC, allows a glimpse of the Hellenistic tradition of public writing (Figure 1. IvE VII.1 3004). Although the carving of letter forms is of a good standard, the organization of the text, with nearly all the words broken off at the end of each line, is not impressive. The letter size of 2.5 cm was legible from a short distance but only if the stone, whose height (1.62 cm) was about that of the average person, was raised (otherwise the reader would be compelled to kneel in order to see the bottom of the dedication). For someone who knew their ‘stone letters’ (or ‘block capitals’), as Petronius’ Hermeros famously claims, reading this text with no indentations, spaces or decorations would have been a formidable task. The formula of this text, typical of Late Hellenistic Greek building dedications, gave prominence to the name of the benefactor, who appeared first, followed by the object dedicated (sometimes this came first) and ending with the names of the recipients (in Ephesus, often Artemis and the demos). For those who could make out elementary aspects of the inscription such as names, the hierarchy it represented was clearly in the favor of the benefactor.

The Arch of Mazeus and Mithridates
The Arch of Mazeus and Mithridates was erected at the entrance to the South gate of the Tetargonos Agora ca. 50 years after the previous dedication. It was commissioned by two freedmen of the Imperial household who dedicated the monument in honor of their patrons (Augustus and Marcus Agrippa). The monument, reconstructed beautifully by the Austrian team, is clearly reminiscent of a Roman triumphal arch with three

---

18 Petr., Satyr. 58.7: lapidarias litteras scio.
19 Further examples of texts from this period at Ephesus will be discussed later. Similar dedications, naming the benefactor followed by the object dedicated and recipients can be found all over the Graeco–Roman world during this period (i.e. Keppie, L. (1991) Understanding Roman Inscriptions (Baltimore) 54-58).
entranceways, a triple fascia architrave and dentiliculated cornices (Figure 2a: Arch of Mazeus and Mithridates). This stylistic choice was at odds with the other entrances to the Tetragonos Agora, which followed Classical Greek style architecture. The monument’s architecture is not the only aspect which created a contrast with the existing traditions of the monumental landscape. The dedications, recorded across the upper panels of the arches, show fundamental changes in the representation of public writing. Perhaps the most obvious is the use of large bronze letters (which do not survive) of roughly the same size (ca. 12-15 cm), in all three panels. Instead of being inscribed and painted, like the Hellenistic text, the bronze letters in this inscription gleamed in the sunlight and would have been considerably more visible to the ancient viewer. One does not need to be literate to recognize the expense and honor inherent in the use of this material. Of equal importance is the use of a bilingual inscription, which is the first known example in this context at Ephesus. While other bilingual texts were evident in the city at this time, this inscription was the first (of those surviving) to have two distinct messages represented to the viewer, rather than the same message recorded in two different languages.

Left Arch

1  Imp. Caesari Divi. f. Augusto pontifici maximo, cos. XII, tribunic. potest. XX et Liviae Caesaris Augusti et
4  Mazeus Caesaris Augusti et

Middle Arch

Mazeus Mithridates
toi̱j tw̱i dẖj
t o i r j̱ p a t r w s i k a t w i ð h [m w i j]

Latin Text

To Emperor Augustus, son of divine Caesar, pontifex maximus, consul for the 12th time, tribune potestas for the 20th time and to Marcus Agrippa, son of Lucius, consul for the fourth time, and Livia, wife of Caesar Augustus and Julia the daughter of Caesar Augustus, Mazeus and Mithridates (gave this monument) to the patrons.

Greek Text

Mazeus and Mithridates (dedicated this monument) to their patrons and the Demos.

---

20 Scherrer, P., ENG, 142-144. Reconstructions of the West Gate of the Agora by G. Niemann depict a typical post and lintel design propylon with ionic columns (FiE III, 62).
22 This is a misspelling by the carver, who mistook ‘p’ for ‘b’, probably a phonetic mistranslation.
For all viewers of this monument, a clear progression has been made in the appearance of public writing. The organization of all three inscriptions has improved considerably from Hellenistic practice. No words are cut in line breaks and in both inscriptions the lines also separate the benefactors from the recipients of the dedication. However, the most impressive visual statement contained in these inscriptions is the vast difference between the appearance of the Greek and Latin texts. The Latin panels (Figures 2b & 2d) in slightly smaller letters (12-14 cm) dominate the two larger panels, which stand in front of the middle panel, casting the recessed Greek inscription into the shade. The average observer could not only be expected to see the difference between the alphabet, but he would also have seen that the Latin texts were both more lengthy and more clearly laid out on the space. The use of marks between words, indentations and spaces highlighted different individuals as well as the different roles the individuals played, which facilitated a level of comprehension from a less literate audience. Abbreviations of names and titles of the Roman grandees Augustus, Livia and Agrippa could also be associated with the images and inscriptions of statues above the arch, in the State Agora and on coins, giving further aid to those attempting to decipher the Latin. In comparison the Greek text, located in the recessed central arch (Figure 2c), must have appeared both shorter and more nebulous on account of its lack of spaces, indentations or association with the symbolism used for the imperial family, especially for those who knew nothing of public writing. Moreover, the Greek word for ‘patron’ has clearly been borrowed from the Latin.

For those who could read them, the inscriptions offer two quite different statements and representations of hierarchy. The Latin inscriptions begin with a dedicatory formula, henceforth called the ‘Imperial formula’, which became popular under Augustus listing the imperial recipient of a monument first and therefore giving the emperor the most prominent position in the text. The top two lines of each Latin panel list Augustus and Marcus Agrippa followed by their respective offices (both indented in line 2). The third

23 Seated statues of Augustus and Livia, followed by other Julio-Claudian family members, have been found in the Chalcidicum at the State Agora (Scherrer, 1995, 5) along with a statues of Augustus found in the Varius baths (IvE II. 252) and in the south gate of the Tetragonos Agora (IvE VII.1. 3007).

line lists their wives, Livia and Julia. It is only on the last line that the names of the dedicators, Mazeus and Mithridates, are given. The order of importance and the use of space clearly favors the imperial family. In contrast, the Greek inscription begins, as is traditional, with the names of the benefactors on the top line. The recipients, ‘their patrons’, who receive the majority of the text in the Latin inscription are subverted in the Greek text with their names, titles and references to their spouses omitted. Moreover, the _demos_ (of whom no mention is made in the Latin inscriptions) are also included as recipients.

Differences in the presentation of the texts lead one to question the function of the bilingual text: Are the disparities in these texts meant to reflect the duality of the benefactors as men who recognized the subtleties of both cultures of benefaction? Or were the two inscriptions simply intended to make different statements to different audiences? Neither of these explanations need exclude the other. However, what is clear is that the Latin text, which offered a more clear format of language and symbolism than its Greek counterpart, may have been more widely recognizable not only to Romans and the elite but also the rising mercantile classes, who conducted trade regularly with Romans in this context. It is impossible to know the level of comprehension that the benefactors expected from their ancient audience. One can, however, observe the numerous ways in which this inscription presented a monumental appearance that was new to this context.

Mazeus and Mithridates’ dedication is an apt example of the problems scholars often face in assessing the function and meaning of bilingual inscriptions.\(^{25}\) Contrary to the published version of the text in which the presentation of Greek and Latin texts would appear equal in terms of light, visibility and the letter sizes, the monumental appearance of the languages in this dedication were not presented in an equal light. The Latin texts are clearly dominant in their architectural position on frontal entablatures and are given significantly more words and space. This message of _Romanitas_ is further supported by

\(^{25}\) For example, does the oblique reference to patrons in the Greek text assume that the reader could make the connection between both inscriptions?
the choice of architecture, an arch with Roman style decoration. While the ability to read the texts would have made the monumental message of this structure explicit, it was, like the architecture, sculpture, and display of writing, by no means the only way in which such messages could be conveyed. Indeed, one need not be literate to read this monument’s message regarding the representation of Greek and Roman writing, or the disjuncture between the honorees and the recipients of dedication.

The East Hall of the Tetragonos Agora (ca. AD 54-59)

The next surviving monument in this context was constructed some 50 years later. Before discussing the appearance of its monumental inscriptions, it is important to acknowledge briefly the changes which took place in the epigraphic landscape at Ephesus. Greek monumental inscriptions during the reign of Nero show an increase in dedications to the imperial family throughout the city as well as a broader range of benefactors, especially those of mercantile freedmen, who benefited from increased social mobility and secure seas. Their status is reflected in the types of projects, which are more closely associated with their own lives and livelihoods: a customs house, a stadium and a trade hall at the side of the Tetragonos Agora. These Greek dedications represent a consistent use of the ‘Imperial formula’ (seen in the Latin text above) which includes recipients first (Artemis, the imperial family and the demos) followed by the benefactor and often members of his family.  

The introduction of the imperial family and the dedicating family into this monumental formula at the same time seems to be a deliberate attempt on the part of the benefactor to present himself within the social sphere and hierarchy that he has created. This juxtaposition often appears to have been reinforced visually in the words of the inscription, in the arrangement of the text and with imagery in the form of statues. These trends should be borne in mind in the following analysis of the dedication from the East Hall.

26 For example, IvE Ia. 20 included numerous family groups (husband, wife, son and daughter) and was dedicated to Nero, Agrippina and Octavia; II. 411 was a father (also a freedman) and daughter dedication to Nero; VII.1. 3003 included a husband and wife who dedicated to Claudius, Nero and Agrippina.

27 The increasing role and significance of the Imperial family in dedications throughout Asia Minor is discussed in Price, S., (1984) Rituals and Power: The Imperial Cult in Asia Minor (Cambridge) 162-163.

28 IvE VII. 1 3003.
The East Hall was dedicated by Claudia Metrodora and her husband (whose name does not survive).\(^{29}\) It is often referred to as “Nero’s Hall” after the dedication and the numerous statues of Nero and his family that have been found nearby.\(^{30}\) Unlike its neighboring arch, the East Hall was a double aisled Doric basilica which is not strongly associated with Nero or Roman architectural styles (Figure 3a. East Hall drawing).\(^{31}\)

Although aspects of the adjacent bilingual dedication and the representation of further members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty (in the text and in statues) created a sense of continuity between the two monuments, the appearance of the inscription and the monument is quite distinct. The building and its dedication can be seen as another stage in the representation of public writing in this context (Map 2, no. 62).

Part 1 (Latin text)
1 Dianae Ephesiae, Divo Clau[dio, Neroni Claudio Caesari Augusto
[[ Germa] nico]] \( \mathfrak{g} \), Agrippinae Aug[ustae], civita[ti Ephesiorum]
2 [----- \( \mathfrak{g} \) cum Claudia Metro[adora] uxor[e]

Part 2 (Greek text)
1 [\( \text{A} \text{r} \text{t} \text{e} \text{m} \text{i} \text{d} \text{i} \text{B} \text{e} \text{s} \text{i} \text{a}\)
\( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{w} \text{K} \text{l} \text{a} \text{u} \text{d} \text{i} \text{n} \text{w} \text{N} \text{e} \text{r} \text{w} \text{n} \text{i} \text{K} \text{l} \text{a} \text{u} \text{d} \text{i} \text{j} \text{w} \text{K} \text{a} \text{i} \text{s} \text{a} \text{r} \text{i}
\( \text{S} \text{e} \text{b} \text{a} \text{s} \text{t} \text{w} \text{[} \text{G} \text{e} \text{r} \text{m} \text{a} \text{n} \text{i} \text{k} \text{w} \text{]} \text{G} \text{r} \text{i} \text{p} \text{p} \text{e} \text{i} \text{n} \text{h} \text{]} \text{S} \text{e} \text{b} \text{a} \text{s} \text{t} \text{w} \text{E} \text{f} \text{e} \text{s} \text{i} \text{w} \text{n}
\text{d} \text{h} \text{m} \text{w} \text{[}
2 [----- \( \text{O} \text{k} \text{t} \text{j} \text{w} \text{N} \text{e} \text{d} \text{i} \text{n} \text{n} \text{k} \text{a} \text{t} \text{a} \text{k} \text{e} \text{u} \text{a} \text{s} \text{a} \text{j}
\text{a} \text{h} \text{e} \text{p} \text{h} \text{k} \text{e} \text{n} \text{s} \text{u} \text{n} \text{K} \text{l} \text{a} \text{u} \text{d} \text{i} \text{a} \text{M} \text{h} \text{t} \text{r} \text{o} \text{d} \text{w} \text{a} \text{[} \text{h} \text{g} \text{u} \text{a} \text{n} \text{a} \text{i} \text{ki}\

To Ephesian Artemis, Divine Claudius, Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, Agrippina Augusta, (and) the Ephesian Demos. [………..] built with his own funds (and) he dedicated (it ) with Claudia Metrodora, his wife

The appearance of the Greek and Latin inscriptions, though not exactly equal, is more unified than the diverse traditions reflected in Mazeus and Mithridates’ dedication. In addition to conveying the same information in both languages, both texts have adopted the ‘Imperial formula’ of dedication. This more balanced appearance is also conveyed in the presentation of the text. The bilingual texts are presented separately with a similar

\(^{29}\) Claudia Metrodora is likely the daughter of Tiberius Claudius Metrodorus, a wealthy merchant and major donor of the Neronian telonion (customs house); IvE Ia. 20 lines 19-25 refer to the donation of this man and his wife. Tiberius Claudius Metrodorus, like so many benefactors of the telonion, was probably a freedman.

\(^{30}\) Statues from the East Hall are: Germanicus (IvE II. 255a), Nero & Agrippina (IvE VII.1. 3003) as well as Drusus, Agrippina and Nero (IvE II. 256). All but Germanicus’ statue had bilingual bases.

\(^{31}\) A photograph of a fragment from this text has been published (FiE III, no.3) but it is of very poor quality.
textual arrangement and create an image of association between the imperial recipients and the two dedicators, who are placed in central and parallel positions on the line below. Unlike the dedication of Mithridates and Mazeus’ Arch, the juxtaposition of the texts and the use of line breaks at similar points create an image of Latin and Greek epigraphy as comparable. The inscriptions represent a similar hierarchy with respect to the order in which people are presented, which is further articulated by the inclusion of laurel leaves between the names of the emperor and his wife and between Metrodora’s husband and herself in both Greek and Latin versions. The purpose of this decoration is threefold: to draw attention to the four main figures of the inscription, to connect the Imperial recipients with the dedicators and to illustrate clearly to the viewer, where similar aspects of both inscriptions lie. If one could follow the decorations, one could easily see the most important part of the inscription: the names of the individuals involved.

However, as one observes in many bilingual inscriptions at Ephesus, all is not equal. The Latin text has been given a more prominent appearance with larger letters and with its spatial placement on the building. The Latin letters (11 cm on line one and 8 cm on line two) give prominence and priority to the recipients of the dedication, while the Greek text offers a less imposing appearance with letters of only 7.5 cm throughout. The spatial placement of the Latin text above the Greek text and its frontal location on a protruding architrave cast a shadow upon the Greek text (not unlike that of the Greek text in Mazeus and Mithridates dedication) which was carved below in a recessed area of the building. These changes in the appearance of the monumental inscription can be seen to make a similar monumental statement to that which is inherent in a reading of the text.

While the result of a new monumental approach to Greek writing is both a more unified and mutually comprehensible representation of both the Greek and Latin language, the message for this ancient viewer is still far from ‘balanced’. Although the greater uniformity of both inscriptions may have aided the reader, the use of Latin and the representation of the text in its appearance and location in the monumental space create a

---

32 Kearsely R., 1999 and 2001 (op cit. note 3).
33 The monumental inequalities in representation of the language demonstrate further the difficulties of asserting ‘balanced bilingualism’ as set out in Adams 2003, 6-7.
symbolic statement of Imperial power which could be seen by any member of the audience.\textsuperscript{34} The use of the ‘Imperial formula’ (previously ascribed only to Latin inscriptions) in the Greek text could also be construed as part of this statement, but this is not to say that it was therefore, a kind of ‘Romanisation’. Any benefactor stood to gain from a representation of language that may have extended the readership of his message. Moreover, it is worth noting that the ‘Imperial formula’ (excepting the Arch of Mazeus and Mithridates, which was dedicated to their patrons) gave the primary position to Ephesian Artemis (followed by the Imperial family). As a result, the new hierarchy created by this formula served primarily to reaffirm the name of the city and its goddess.

\textbf{The Library of Celsus}

The next project to change the appearance of the Tetragonos Agora’s South Gate was the Library of Celsus (\textit{ca.} AD 110-120) constructed in honor of Tiberius Julius Celsus Polemaeanus a former consul at Rome (\textit{ca.} AD 92) proconsul of Asia (\textit{ca.} AD 106) and a high ranking officer in the Roman military.\textsuperscript{35} Lying adjacent to Mazeus and Mithridates Arch and the East Hall, the aediculated two-storey façade of the library would have been visible to all who approached the Tetragonos Agora (\textbf{Map 2 no. 55, Figure 4. Library of Celsus}), especially those who came from the city’s most prominent political centre: the State Agora. The function of the building as a heroon and a library shows, like its monumental inscriptions, an interesting amalgamation of recent trends and traditional culture. Commissioned between AD 110-114 and completed by his son Aquila sometime in the reign of Hadrian, Celsus’ library was a contemporary of Trajan’s libraries, which flanked his funerary monument (the column of Trajan), completed by his adopted son, Hadrian.\textsuperscript{36} Like Trajan’s libraries, this structure may have possessed Greek and Latin

\textsuperscript{34} “…it should not be assumed that the aim of a bilingual inscription is always simply to reach the maximum readership… such bilinguals as there are in Greek regions might sometimes have included Latin for symbolic purposes: the very presence of Latin, even if it is not understood, symbolizes the Romanness of imperial power.” (Adams 2003, 32). See pages 30-42 for further discussion.

\textsuperscript{35} PIR\textsuperscript{2} J 260. His military career, not included on the building dedication, is recorded on two statue bases (one Latin, one Greek) at each side of the monument (\textit{IvE VII.2. 5102-5103}).

\textsuperscript{36} PIR\textsuperscript{2} J 168 (Aquila). Claridge, A. ‘Hadrian’s column of Trajan’ \textit{JRA} 6 (1993) 5-21. Located between the east and west (Greek and Latin) wings of his library, Trajan’s monumental column, which was shaped like a scroll, was spatially and thematically associated with the adjacent buildings (V. Huet, ‘Stories one
collections, implied by the two equestrian statue bases, one in Greek the other in Latin, at either side of the stairwell, which were followed by statues depicting Celsus’ Greek/Roman and civilian/military identities. The architecture and imagery of the structure have been studied and compared with other monuments in Asia Minor from a similar period but the appearance of the monumental dedication and the relationship of this monument with adjacent monuments in the context have not been addressed, despite the fact this is principally the way in which the monument would have been seen by the ancient viewer.

The most prominent monumental inscription from this building is the dedication which is inscribed in large (9.5 cm) letters across its frontal entablature. Perhaps the first observation to be made about this dedication is that it is only written in Greek. This development in itself is an interesting progression from the preceding monumental inscriptions in this context, which began with an inscription that was primarily Latin (Figure 2), followed by a more balanced representation of the languages, in which the Latin text is still quite prominent (Figure 3). The inscription as it stands today is beautifully reconstructed and painted in red letters across the architrave of the first storey (Figures 5a-c), beginning with the name of the honored individual in the accusative followed by the name of the dedicator and the overseer of the works. Although the inscription is one line, the form of the architectural space with outer porches and recessed entablatures has the visual effect of breaking up the text. The role of the building’s shape in promoting the monumental message is a vital part of the inscription’s function and appearance, evident to the ancient viewer but omitted from the published text.

38 Smith 1998, 75.
39 HEl VII.2, 5001.
40 It is worth noting that this is relatively consistent with the decrease in monumental bilingual inscriptions throughout the city at this time.
41 The use of the accusative case in the building dedication, like that used in dedication of Pollio’s monument (HEl II. 405), is characteristic of Greek funerary monuments but can also be seen in honorary dedications (cf. Adams (2002) discussion of the bilingual dedication at Delos (op. cit. note 3)).
Tiberius Julius Celsus Polemeanus, consul and proconsul of Asia. Tiberius Julius Aquila, the proconsul and son, built the library. The work, completed by the heirs of Aquila, was overseen by Tiberius Claudius Aristion, thrice Asiarch.

Perhaps one of the most difficult aspects of working with published translations of inscriptions in the standard Greek text format is the extent to which this format detracts from our understanding of an inscription’s actual public appearance. This limitation is most evident in inscriptions which have been arranged over a complex shifting architectural space. Based on the text above (as it is set out in *IvE*), one would assume that the information was presented equally on the façade of the monument. This is not the case. The arrangement of the text over four extending porches draws attention to four focal points in the text, which record the names of the individuals involved in the building project: the recipient (Ti. Julius Polemaeanus), the dedicator (Ti. Julius Aquila), who carried out the work and the overseer of the project (Ti. Claudius Aristion). Celsus’ name was placed in the frontal entablature of the first porch (*Figure 5a*). Aquila, whose name appears on the second and third porches (*Figures 5a–b*), is seen both as a son of Celsus and progenitor of those who completed the works. The role of Aristion as overseer is recorded on the fourth porch by two decorative leaves which mark out and emphasize the gamma (Aristion’s repeated tenure of the asiarchy) rather than his role as *epimeletes* (*Figure 5c*). All of the frontal porches have indentations at each end of the text, demonstrating the careful and deliberate arrangement of the text onto these spaces. Aspects of the text recording Celsus’ titles, the verb for construction, the description of the building as a library, as well as the words specifying the roles of Aquila and Aristion, are placed in the shadows of the recessed porches.

**Monumental appearance**

42 *PIR*² C 788.

43 *Cf.* the discussion regarding the use of a decorative leaf in *IvE* VI. 3003 and 3005 (pp. 159-160).
While this text does not use the ‘Imperial formula’, (one does not generally dedicate a funerary monument to anyone other than the deceased) it bears many aspects of change that have been observed in the previous dedications from this context. Architectural space and decorations are used to articulate the names of individuals and their roles in the project (which was also supported by statues of Celsus and Aquila on the frontal porches above). In addition to adopting these characteristics, the Greek dedication used abbreviations for praenomina (eg. Ti for Tiberius) which are accentuated by stop marks. The names on the front porches have also been centered with considerably more space between the words, making them more discernable to a broader audience. Examining the inscription in this light yields a different feel to the image of the inscription and, in some respects, a different message. In this inscription, more than the previously discussed Greek texts, the main sections of the text stand independently in the architectural space and are emphasized by spaces and decorations. Knowledge of syntax or grammar is not required to discern the focus of the dedication, namely, the individuals involved.

This spatial arrangement of the text is deliberate. Further proof of manipulation in the monumental text can be observed in a comparison with a more detailed version of the dedication.\textsuperscript{44} Omissions from the detailed dedication include: Aquila’s full name (Ti. Julius Aquila Polemaeanus) on the second porch, the singular definite article before Aquila’s name (line 23) on the third porch, as well as the description of the work (\textsuperscript{44} \textsuperscript{44} AE VII.2. 5113: ll. 22 -4: a)partis\ntwn tw\n tou= Akula klhronomnto so\n epime\nto kata\diaq\kh\n | Tib. Klaudiou Aristi\nw by\xa0| vac. a\$ia\n xou. “Completed by the heirs of Aquila, the work was overseen, according to the will, by Tiberius Claudius Aristion, thrice Asiarch.” While there is no evidence that this inscription came first, it clearly contains more information than has been provided in the monumental dedication.
eιγόν) and the mention of will (καταδιασχέψει). Had these elements been part of the monumental text, they would have compromised its organization on the architectural space significantly. There seems little other reason to exclude this sort of information about the dedication, unless it had a direct effect on the monumental message.

The Greek dedication on this monument is unparalleled in terms of its clarity and arrangement in the monumental context. With respect to its arrangement on the architectural space, its use of decorations, abbreviations stop marks, and indentations to emphasize the names of the individuals involved, it can be seen as the final step in the development of the Greek monumental tradition from its Hellenistic display at the turn of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD to the zenith of the ‘Second Sophistic’ and the height of the ‘epigraphic habit’ in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD.\textsuperscript{45} Indeed, it could be argued that elements of this Greek dedication more closely resemble the appearance of the Latin dedications in the preceding monuments from this context.

To compare the appearance of Greek monumental language on Celsus’ dedication with the Greek on Mazeus and Mithridates dedication is to see a number of significant changes in the representation of Greek. From a brief Greek text which was presented as a block of words cast into shadows by larger and more clearly organized Latin texts to a Greek dedication which stood independently, utilizing the light, the architectural space and organization (emphasized by indentations, stop marks, and decorations) as a means of expressing specific individuals, the development of Greek monumental inscriptions from the South gate demonstrates a striking visual transformation in the urban landscape. It has been noted that Macmullen’s discussion of the epigraphic habit carefully describes the phenomenon as ‘Roman’ instead ‘Latin’, thus emphasizing the cultural rather than linguistic nature of the habit.\textsuperscript{46} Perhaps one of the broader implications of the epigraphic habit as a ‘cultural’ movement is the fact that it can be observed not only in the language

\textsuperscript{45} The significant rise in the frequency of inscriptions in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD, was observed by MacMullen, R. (1982) ‘The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire’ \textit{AJP} 233-46, and has since been substantiated by further studies (Meyer, E. (1990) ‘Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: the Evidence of Epitaphs’ \textit{JRS} 80 78-81, and Woolf, G., (1998) \textit{Becoming Roman. The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul} (Cambridge) 103.

\textsuperscript{46} Bodel 2001, 6.
but in the appearance and the representation of writing. If so, then the developments observed in Greek dedications from this context between the early 1st to the mid second century AD can been seen a part of this cultural revolution. In fact, if one were to argue that a greater frequency of inscriptions was indicative of a greater ‘sense of audience’, then this visual development in the organization and clarity of the monumental message would be expected.47 It is now necessary to establish that this pattern of development is evident beyond the context of the Tetragonos Agora. With this aim in mind, the following discussion will examine the developing representation of Greek monumental writing in two other contexts from Ephesus, one which contained Augustan bilingual inscriptions (the State Agora) and one which did not (the Theatre).48

Part II. Comparanda from other urban contexts at Ephesus.

A. Texts from the State Agora

Augustan dedications

Unlike the Tetragonos Agora, the State Agora at Ephesus had few pre-existing Hellenistic monuments, and it is generally considered an Augustan addition to the city, which was created as a new political and civic center for the city’s new role as provincial capital.49 In this context there is a similar propagation of bilingual inscriptions in the early first century AD followed by a transformation in the appearance of monumental Greek dedications. Augustan bilingual building dedications in this context date from 23 BC to AD 12 and include the dedication of pavement for the Embolos (Figures 6a-b. IνΕ II. 459 (text and drawing)), found by Domitian’s Street at the upper edge of the State Agora and the dedication of the Basilica Stoa on the south colonnade of the State Agora by a Roman citizen (Figure 7. Drawing of IνΕ II. 404), C. Sextilius Pollio (Map 3 no.

47 Macmullen 1982 (op.cit. note 44) 246.
48 Numerous bilingual dedications dating to the Augustan period of the State Agora have been found in monuments to G. Sextilius Pollio (IνΕ II. 404-407, two of which are building dedications) and the paving of the Embolos (IνΕ II. 459). No bilingual texts from the theatre survive despite the large corpus of Augustan material which have been discovered.
While both monumental dedications record roughly the same information in Greek and Latin, the representation of languages, as observed in the Tetragonos Agora, is far from equal. In the case of the Augustan repaving of the Embolos, which dates to 23/22 BC, the Greek text was recorded in small letters below the larger and more prominent Latin text. The arrangement of the Greek text, with no indentations, decorations or spaces between the words appears, in comparison to the Latin text, to be one solid block of letters, which lacks both the clarity and the sophistication of its Latin counterpart. The two languages in this inscription represent two different traditions of monumental writing.

Pollio’s Basilica Stoa offers some parallels with dedications from the Tetragonos Agora. The Stoa (dedicated in AD 11) and the Arch of Mazeus and Mithridates were both Augustan structures functioning as urban armatures, bearing bilingual inscriptions in bronze letters and conveying a close relationship between the benefactor and the Imperial family, which was reinforced with statue groups. However, there are clear differences between the benefactors, the appearance of their monuments and the accompanying monumental inscriptions. Pollio was a wealthy Roman official, whose role and relationship with the emperor are attested in the numerous projects. The Basilica Stoa, a two storey, triple aisle, monumental passageway with Ionic column capitals (Figure 8. Drawing of the Basilica Stoa) provided a unilateral architectural front and covered passageway for many civic buildings (the Prytaneion, the temenos of Augustus and Artemis and the bouleuterion) was better integrated into its urban context than Mazeus and Mithridates’ building (Figure 9. Drawing of the State Agora). In contrast with the stark variations in representation and translation of Mazeus and Mithridates Greek and Latin dedications, Pollio’s monumental display represents the two languages in a more balanced but still not equal light. The monumental dedication of the Basilica Stoa, which invokes the ‘Imperial formula’ and supplies similar information in terms of the language

---

50 *IvE* II.459 and 404 (respectively). Pollio was also granted a funerary monument in this context with a bilingual dedication but these texts are quite fragmentary (*IvE* II 405).
51 The colonnade ended in a hall of imperial statues depicting Augustus, Livia and probably Tiberius (Scherrer 2001, 71).
52 Pollio and son worked with Augustus and Tiberius on the *Aqua Throesstitica* (*IvE* II. 402; VII.1. 3092-3).
but depicts the Greek text in smaller letters next to a grander and more articulate Latin text, is more comparable to the East Hall dedication.

Latin

1. Basilicam Dianae Ephesiae et Imperatori Caesar Augusti pontifici maximo tribunicia potestate XXX ... Cos. XIII imp. XX patri patriae et Tiberio Caesar Augusti

Greek

1. basilikh stoa n Artemidi Efesi i Kaiarı Autokratori Kaišari Qeou uiw S ebast w fā xierei megis tw dhmar xikh e tōsiaj toll; upatwitol iγ; autokratori toλkj; patridoj kai Tiberiwi i Kaisari Seb astou uiw-

Fundamentally, the greatest distinction between the Latin and Greek inscriptions is not the letter size but the fact that the Greek inscription has no apparent spaces, decorations or indentations to break up the text (Figure 7). While it carries the image of writing, there is no attempt to distinguish sections or individuals in this text, let alone words themselves. As a result, the Greek text appears as an endless line of letters which, unlike the East Hall dedication, presented Greek writing as a separate tradition that was not

53. Letters sizes are not published but detailed (to scale) drawings show the Latin forms about 20-21 cm and smaller Greek forms about 17-18 cm in height (W. Alzinger, ÖJAI 50 (1972-1975) Beiblatt 264-79).

mutually compatible or comprehensible. Was the Greek included here meant to be read or was it merely provided out of courtesy and/or as a symbolic statement? One can never know the motivations of the benefactors or the literate level of the audience. However, one can discern the appearance of the text and the considerable difficulties and disparities it presented to the viewer.

Another example of a monumental bilingual inscription from the Augustan period at Ephesus was found in the Artemision during the British excavations of the 19th century. The monumental appearance of the inscription offers similarly unbalanced images of Greek and Latin epigraphy. It also illustrates the importance of assessing (when possible) an image of an inscription along with its published text. The published version of this inscription, dating to 5/6 BC and recording Augustus’ role as overseer in a renovation of the temple enclosure, presents two very similar looking texts to the reader.

1 Imp. Caesar Divi f. Aug. cos. XII tr.pot. XVIII pontifex Maximus ex reditu Dianae fanum et Augusteum muro muniendum curavit C. Asinio [[Gallo pro.cos.]] curatore Sex. Lartidio leg.

5 Autokratwr Kaišar Qeou-uíj Sebástoj upatój toj ib’, dhmárxikh’ ēcousiáj toj ih’
6 [e tôj tw miérw muthj qeou-pr threshold vacat new kaitoj Sebasthen tixisqhmai proenohjhi
7 [[e póia ηqupa tô Gaiw Ϗ Asiníwb Gállou]], épimel háj Seístoub Lártidíwb presbeutou-

The translation of the texts and the appearance of the published text suggest a sense of balance and equality to the reader. To examine the image of this inscription, however, is to see a different message entirely (Figure 10. IV E V. 1522). Again, the Latin text is

---

55 ΚΕ V. 1522
given the first and most prominent position on the inscription, which is further emphasized by larger letters. The first line, recording Augustus’ names and titles is by far the largest, while smaller letters on the two lines below record who paid for the monument (the revenues of the sanctuary). Smaller than any of the Latin letters is the Greek text, which appears diminished in terms of size and formidable in its spatial organization and arrangement as single block of text. In the middle of the Greek text there is a large and deep gash in the stone. The letters, which have been carefully carved around it, attest to the fact that it was there at the time the inscription was made. It is clear that the text was organized so that only the Greek text was compromised by the imperfection. There is little that is balanced about the portrayal of languages on this inscription. Yet, many of the most fundamental differences between the two languages, the size and appearance of the letters, the large gash in the stone, are not clearly evident in the published version.

These Augustan inscriptions provide an image of monumental Greek writing at the start of the 1st century AD that was universally unimpressive, especially when seen in comparison with an accompanying Latin text. Monumental Greek of the Augustan period was recorded in smaller letters and was often visually subjugated below the Latin text and/or cast into the shadows by its architectural location. Moreover, the visual arrangement of the text, without spaces, indentations or decoration presented a formidable obstacle to any but the most zealous of readers. None can say how many people read these inscriptions. However, a study of their appearance reveals how very little was done to encourage a reading or to create any distinctions in the text. While the symbolism of maintaining the Greek language was clearly important to Greeks and Romans alike, the extent to which it was presented as tradition on a par with its Latin counterpart is surely debatable. This understanding of Greek monumental traditions is crucial in appreciating the subsequent developments which took place over the next century in the appearance of Greek writing.
Flavian comparanda and the practice of damnatio memoriae

Flavian dedicatory inscriptions demonstrate significant changes in the monumental formula and appearance of inscriptions before the turn of the 2nd century AD. Few building dedications at the State Agora survive from this period in a form which allows for a monumental reconstruction. However, a series of statue bases from monuments around Domitian’s street (Map 3) illustrate changes in the appearance and presentation of monumental Greek writing which are similar to those observed in the Tetragonos Agora. The first of these is a rectangular base honoring C. Laecanius Bassus, proconsul of Asia in AD 80-81, who built a hydredocheion “water reservoir” (Map 3, no. 29). Bassus’ text, presented only in Greek, shows visible changes in the presentation of the language (Figure 11. IvE III. 695). Indentations are made between the section naming the honorand and the dedicatory, while punctuation marks are added at the ends of clauses, praenomen and numerical representations. These characteristics, unaccompanied by a Latin text, show a significant adoption of new elements in the organisation and appearance of the Greek monumental writing, which increased an inscription’s beauty as well as the clarity of its message to a broader audience. This change in presentation also demonstrates a new image for Greek inscriptions in this context, as something more closely akin to their Latin counterparts. The two contrasting traditions of Latin and Greek represented on Pollio’s dedication have already evolved into a new tradition of Greek, which has adopted aspects of textual organization and appearance that were previously observed in only Latin inscriptions.

Similar traits can also be seen on a series of bases from various cities dedicated to the emperor in honor of Ephesus’ newly granted neokoros status, ca. AD 90. These bases, found in the vicinity of the Imperial cult temple to Domitian (later rededicated to the Divine Vespasian and the Theoi Sebastoi), show similar use of spaces, indentations and letter size to underline specific aspects of the text: namely the Emperor, the proconsul

---

56 IvE II. 413-18. While the published versions of the inscriptions can attest to the adoption of the ‘Imperial formula’ of dedication and the organization of the text in terms of line breaks, they do not reflect the appearance of the text or its location in the monumental context.
58 Spaces and indentations ll. 14, 22, 23, 25; punctuation ll. 1, 4, 10, 15, 19.
(effectively dating the text), and the benefactors (the *demos* of various cities).\textsuperscript{59} Though each text is slightly different in terms of its layout, each uses indentations and larger letters to accentuate three different parts of the text: the recipient, the dedicatees, and the high priest of Asia (Figures 12 a-c).\textsuperscript{60} In all cases the name and titles of the emperor and the role of the *demos* are emphasized by significantly larger ‘supersize’ letters.\textsuperscript{61} All of these elements serve to highlight specific aspects of the inscription to make the message more clear. In addition, the repeated use of the formula, the arrangement of the text and the physical appearance of the letters meant that if one could understand one of these inscriptions, he would easily be able to understand the others. While the layout of these inscriptions is far from perfect, they represent a visibly more coherent image of the text than their aforementioned Augustan predecessors, who depicted the Greek text as a block of indistinguishable letters.

Finally, these texts demonstrate the Roman practice of *damnatio memoriae*.\textsuperscript{62} It has been argued that this monumental process was easily overlooked by a largely illiterate audience.\textsuperscript{63} However, it is worth noting that in the aesthetic monumentality of the Roman world, a large gash in a well-arranged inscription was something everyone could see, with or without the benefit of literacy. If the appearance of a text was so negligible, why did carvers go to such lengths to create a well arranged *ordinatio*? In fact, the predilection of *damnatio memoriae* for monumental dedications and prominent locations\textsuperscript{64} would seem to contradict the idea that this was a random symbolic process with a small intended audience. Moreover, the significance of this act was not limited to inscriptions but is also

\textsuperscript{59} IV E II. 234-5; V. 1498.

\textsuperscript{60} Indentation and centralisation of the final word of each of the aforementioned sections can be observed in IV E II. 234: lines 6, 10 and 15, 235: 7, 14; V. 6, 16, and 19.

\textsuperscript{61} ‘Supersize’ letters introduce the first two sections in IV E II. 234: lines 1-3 and 7 (the third section of this text is clearly evident by a large space), 235: 1-3, 8, and 15; V. 1498 lines 1-3, 7 and 17.

\textsuperscript{62} This monumental practice is not necessarily Roman in origin but it was redefined in during the Imperial period where it was carried out on an Empire-wide basis by decree of the Roman Senate. In Ephesus, earlier erasures are known, but these are carried out by the local governing bodies and reserved for kings or allies who fell out of favor IV E II. 133: discussion in C. Borker *ZPE* 37 (1980) 69-75 and response in B. Wesenberg, *ZPE* 41 (1981) 175-180).


\textsuperscript{64} Kajava, M. (1995) 201-10 shows that this practice is not consistently or universally applied, but it is most often evident on prominent honorary monuments.
evident on Imperial portraits and later on coins.\textsuperscript{65} These statue bases, which gave particular prominence to the names and titles of Domitian, have been left with some rather unsightly blemishes. While in some cases the stone has been reinscribed with Vespasian’s name and Theoi Sebastoi;\textsuperscript{66} these words do not fit into the original layout of the text, and the deep cutting of the stone casts a dark shadow over the smaller and crowded recarvings. These bases commemorate the neokoros status granted by the emperor Domitian for his cult at Ephesus, so one must consider what happened when the emperor was subsequently ‘undeified’ by Roman Senate. This was indubitably an unforeseen liability of the new ‘Imperial formula’ as well as the new image of inscriptions, which gave greater emphasis to certain names (and subsequently to certain blemishes in the stone). Having observed the effect of this process on a series of bases, one can only imagine how this might have translated in a broader context of monumental dedications, such as the adjacent Imperial cult temple.\textsuperscript{67} This aspect of monumentality will be explored further in the monumental dedications from the Theatre at Ephesus.

\textit{Trajanic/Hadrianic examples}

The State Agora was filled with monumental buildings by the end of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD and as a result many projects encroached on the Upper Embolos in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD. In this context we find two well preserved and painstakingly reconstructed monuments for which analysis of the monumental dedication is possible. The first of these is a monumental fountain, often called ‘the Nymphaeum of Trajan’ erected by the benefactor Tiberius Claudius Aristion as part of his public works involving the city’s fourth aqueduct (Map 3, no. 38).\textsuperscript{68} Aristion, referred to as princeps Ephesiorum by Pliny the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{65} Varner, E.R. (2004) \textit{Mutilation and Transformation: Damnatio Memoriae in Roman Imperial portraits} (Boston). At Ephesus, a portrait from the Temple to Domitian originally labeled as Domitian, now identified as Titus, is a likely candidate with its disproportionate sized head and elaborate coiffure (associated with Domitian). The head of emperor Caracalla’s brother Geta has been removed on coins from Stratonikea, as seen on the display of coins at the Izmir Museum (SNG von Aulock 2683-2892).
  \item \textsuperscript{66} \textit{IvE} II. 235 and V. 1498.
  \item \textsuperscript{67} Discussions of the monumental implications of damnatio memoriae in this article are limited to surviving instances of ‘Imperial’ erasures, since these tend to be more prominently placed with greater implications for the ideology and the image of Imperial power. Inscriptions where the actual erasure does not survive/has been restored (\textit{IvE} VII.1 3003) or where the erasure is a name other than the emperor (\textit{IvE} V. 1522, depicts the erasure of the proconsul C. Asinius Gallus), will not receive further comment here.
  \item \textsuperscript{68} \textit{IvE} II. 424 and 424A; VII. 1 3217. He is also known from a similar fountain on the southern edge of the State Agora (the ‘Street Fountain’) and his work in the Harbor Gymnasium; cf. \textit{IvE} II. 425, 425A,508.
\end{itemize}
Younger, was one of the city’s first priests of Asia and is also known from the Library of Celsus, where he is named on the frontal entablature of the 4th porch as the overseer of the work. The Nymphaeum of Trajan, which served as the terminus of Aristion’s aqueduct, was built between AD 102-113 and is therefore contemporary with the library of Celsus. The two buildings are similar in terms of architectural appearance, consisting of a large rectangular basin and two floors of aediculated columns with alternating open spaces, though the Nymphaeum boasts a central pediment, which carried a giant statue of Trajan (Figure 13. Drawing of Trajan’s Nymphaeum). These similarities can also be seen in the representation of the monumental dedication, which was arranged on two lines of the entablature. As with the Library of Celsus, the architectural space of the monument significantly affected its appearance. The use of this space as well as indentations and varying letter sizes, unsignalled by the published version of the text, emphasize specific parts of the inscription. The first line was carved on the frieze and the second was carved below in smaller letters on the fascia, minimizing the role of Aristion’s wife and the details of the dedication (Figure 14. Reconstruction of Trajan’s Nymphaeum with inscription (IvE II. 424)).

Published version

2 [me]nt âouîâ | Ludiâ | Lafter anhj -i[f]l | thj | guanikoj |, quga [t]roj | Aristi| a|xie[r]baj kai prutamewj [ | ]w w r[ei]j agagw n di’ou[f] | [kai te]kue[s]en o]k] et ou diako sion kai deka s tadiw n kai to| udreko xien sun panti_w | Ko|swm | a heg ken ek tw [n]i[wi]n]

69 Plin., Ep. 6.31.3. Aristion, “a generous and blamelessly popular man”, successfully defended himself before Trajan, and it is believed that his subsequent offerings are unofficial thanks for the outcome of his trial (D. Schowalter, ‘Honoring the Emperor: Ephesians respond to Trajan’, in H. Freisinger and F. Krinzinger (eds), 100 Jahre österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos (Vienna) 124).

70 The aqueduct, finished ca. AD 113 (IvE VII.1 3217), must have been initiated before AD 111-112.

71 IvE II. 424. No letter sizes are provided, but the letters on line two are at least half the size of those on line one.
Monumental appearance

**Left wing** (only visible to those going south from the State Agora)

1 Ἀρτέμιδι Ἐσία [καὶ] Ἀυτοκράτορι
2 [με]τὰ Λουλαὶ Ἁρτεμί[ν] [τεραν] -[-] [θ] [γ] ὑγναίκοι[

**Frontal view of niches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niche 1</th>
<th>Outer (recessed)</th>
<th>Niche 5</th>
<th>Outer (recessed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ἅφθος</td>
<td>2 φοιτήτρια Ἁσία</td>
<td>tὴ Ἐπιτρ</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niche 3</td>
<td>Central (recessed)</td>
<td>Niche 2</td>
<td>Inner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Τραγιάνω</td>
<td>Καισαριανὸς Ἁσία</td>
<td>Tραγιάνω</td>
<td>Καισαριανὸς Ἁσία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 τὸ ἄνω σταθερὸν καὶ τὸ νέο</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Right wing** (only visible to those going north towards the State Agora)

1 Κλαυδίω Ἀριστιάνῳ Τριάς Ἁσία Ἐίχῃ καὶ νέο |  |
2 υδρεκδοξίον συν πάντω |  |  |

To Ephesian Artemis and Emperor Nerva Trajan Caesar Augustus Germanicus Dacicius and the *patris*, Claudius Aristio, thrice Asiarch and neokoros with his wife Julia Lydia Laternas [...illa(?)], the daughter of Asia, high priestess and prytanis... he prepared the water canal leading through 210 stades and he set up the hydrecdocheion with all accompanying decorations from his own funds.

Perhaps the first aspect of the text which one notices is the way in which the inscription, like that on Celsus’ library, has been broken into segments across the architectural space to accentuate the different individuals in the dedication: Artemis, Trajan, the *patris* and Aristion. The left wing, which was visible only to those going down the Embolos, begins with the first recipient: Ephesian Artemis. Those proceeding in this direction would see this part of the inscription in context with the sacred juncture at the bottom of the Embolos, which connected the roads to Ortygia (Artemis’ birthplace) and the Artemision (*Map 2, nos. 49, 58 and 48*). Trajan, the second recipient, is the architectural, epigraphic and sculptural focus of the monument with his titles in 4 of the 5 frontal niches and his title Sebastos, recorded in the central niche, which held a large portrait statue. The frontal porches on either side of the central niche bear the emperor’s names and titles “Traqian Caesar” and “Germanicus Dacicius”. The two recessed niches carry his
name “Nerva” (niche 1), also referring to his imperial predecessor, and the name of the third individual: “the patris” (niche 4). Efforts made to create these distinctions in spacing are evident in the crowding of the titles on niches 2 and 4 so that the names on the recessed porches: Nerva, Sebastos, and patris stand independently in their niches (1, 3 and 5 respectively) (Figure 15a. IvE II. 424 part 1). These names are juxtaposed with the smaller inscription on the line below, recording the offices of Aristion’s wife (niches 1-2) and the details of the dedication (niches 3-5) (Figure 15b. IvE II. 424 part 2). Aristion receives his own space on the right wing, where his name was seen by all those approaching the State Agora. This was fitting as it was adjacent to the Imperial cult temple of the Sebastoi, in which he had served as high priest three times (Map 3, nos. 28-30). Aristion’s name also featured prominently on Celsus’ library (and was also recorded on his tomb in the Lower Embolos) so one could observe his role in the monumental landscape, whatever their course on the Embolos.72 The use of the architectural space and the monumental landscape to convey a message is not unique to Ephesus or inscriptions throughout the Empire, however, the opportunity to reconstruct both the building and the surrounding monumental landscape to this extent is both unusual and enlightening.

Next to the Nymphaeum of Trajan, P. Quintilius Varius Valens, his wife and daughter utilized Aristion’s new aqueduct to construct public baths, latrines and a monument (Map 2, nos. 41, 43 and 40).73 Though little of Varius’ version of the baths survives (the latrines are in mint condition), the monument and its dedication, often called ‘the Temple of Hadrian’, has been well preserved and reconstructed.74 The Roman style building with a “Syrian pediment” and mythological beings (a crowning bust of Tyche) may indicate a memorial monument (Figure 16, the so called ‘Temple of Hadrian’) dating to the reign of Hadrian (AD 117-128), which suggests the project was roughly contemporary with the works Aristion and Celsus.75 The dedication is carved on three fasciae of the curved archway over the external entranceway (Figures 17a-b. Drawing and photograph of IvE

---

73 IvE II. 429, 455 and 500. Before studies of the sculpture or the restoration of Artemis’ name in the first line, the ‘so called’ Temple of Hadrian was thought to be the city’s second neokoros temple.
74 The monument’s function is unclear. Its unusual decoration has spurred a range of interpretations based on architectural evidence: Price, 1984a, 149-150 and Scherrer, 2001, 75 (respectively).
75 U. Outschar, ENG, 118.
II.429). Though the architectural space is different, the monumental effect and organization are similar to what we have observed of 2nd-century dedications in terms of the monumental formula as well as the use of architectural space and letter sizes to reinforce delineations in the text. The four primary figures in the text: Ephesian Artemis (restored), the emperor, the city (the recipients) and Varius (the benefactor) are made especially prominent on the top on line by large 9.5 cm letters, followed by the names of Varius’ wife and daughter and the objects dedicated in 7 cm letters (line 2), ending with a record of the project’s completion on line two in small 4.5 cm letters (line 3). ^76

**Published version**

2 Oubí hj Oubíøj - sun----thgunaikíkai Ou] jirllh|qugat ji rí_ tòh nàoq ek qemelìnwn sun pantì twi-kòsmwi kai to_eh au[t [w|àgalma_ ektwòdiwn aqehqken epiaqupatouSerbaiùou Inkonkentoj grammateubnotoj tou-dhmou] b'

**Monumental Appearance**

**Left wing**

1 [Artemidí Efesiά kai Autokratorí Kai/]
3 [Oubí hj Oubíøj - sun----

**Central Arch**

1 [sa] rí Traianwí - Adriánwí - Sebastŵ Hí kai tw - new korwi Efesi[w ndhm]wi 2 thgunaikíkai Ou] jirllh|qugat ji tòh nàoq ek qemelìnwn sun pantì twi-kòsmwi kai to_eh au[t [w|àgalma ektwòi]
3 P opliøu Oùdibú] Antw neihou aĩiafxou u'posxomehnou de'epi_ Klaudíbú Loukkela nou-grammatew j tou-dhmou

**Right wing**

1 P opliøj Kuintiøj P opliøu uïbí] Galeriá
2 aqehqken epiaqupatouSerbaiùou Inkonkentoj grammateubnotoj tou-dhmou] b'

^76^ HE II. 429.
To Ephesian Artemis and the Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus and the neokorate Ephesian Demos, Publius Quintilius Gal Varrus Valens, son of Publius, with his wife and his daughter Varilla, set up the temple from the foundations with all the decorations and the cult statue from his own funds, under the proconsulate of Q. Servaeus Innocens, when Publius Vedius Antoninus was asiarch and the secretary of the Demos for the second time, (as) was promised under Tiberius Claudius Lucceianus’ secretarysthip of Demos.

Like Aristion’s dedication, architectural features and letter sizes have been used to create visible distinctions in the text: wings and the central arch in the text give primary focus to Artemis (left wing), Trajan and the demos (central arch) and Varrus (right wing). Instead of niches, the emperor’s titles and the demos are separated by the keystone. A space also exists between the demos (on the right side of the arch) and the names of the benefactor on the right wing. Another similarity between these dedications is the way in which the role of women and the list of dedicated objects have been relegated to a less prominent place in the text (line 2) with smaller letters. However, even the smaller second line has been carefully arranged so that the verb of dedication, a heqhekén, falls just beneath the name of Varrus, reinforcing his image as a benefactor. The last line, carved in a space that seems too small for a monumental text, records the subsequent completion of the building under P. Vedius Antoninus. Arranging a text this long in the unusual winged and arched space must have been a formidable task. Evidence of this challenge can be found in a few places, such as the omega and missing iota from Ἔβαστίῳ (line 1) which infringed upon the keystone or the omega and nu (from ιδίων) (line 2) which were carried over from the arch onto the right wing. The difficulties inherent in the ordinatio only make the monumental appearance of this inscription more impressive.

Dedications from the State Agora demonstrate developments similar to those observed at the Tetragonos Agora in how they represent Greek monumental language. From a formidable and indistinguishable block of text in the Augustan period- to articulate visual statements, these inscriptions illustrate how Greek monumental writing evolved in its utilization of architectural space, letter sizes, spaces, indentations and decorations, to clarify the monumental message. The use of the ‘Imperial’ formula, possibly inspired by Latin epigraphy, also conveys a clear social hierarchy in which Artemis is first, the
imperial family second and the benefactor third (followed by his family and then other
overseers of the work). It is probably not coincidental that all of the aforementioned
developments in the appearance of Greek dedications at Ephesus are characteristics of
Latin monumental writing from Augustan period dedications in the city. Finally, the
practice of damnatio memoriae in this context has demonstrated another manner in which
the monumental message could be conveyed to a broader audience than merely the
literate classes.

This monumental practice will receive further discussion in the following analysis of
dedications at the Theatre in Ephesus. While the increasingly articulate image of
inscriptions did not transcend the need for literacy, it represents at the very least a
considerable effort to clarify the visibility of the monumental message. The final section
will examine the extent to which similar developments are evident in a context with no
(surviving) Latin inscriptions from the first century AD.

B. Examples from the Theatre at Ephesus
Building dedications from the Late Hellenistic/early Augustan dedications to those of the
2nd century renovations in the Theatre at Ephesus demonstrate that similar developments
in the representation of Greek monumental language took place without the existence of
monumental Latin dedications in the immediate context. It is presumably due to the
fragmentary nature of these inscriptions, that few of the images have been published.
However drawings from the Austrian teams allow for the reconstruction of a text’s
appearance, including letter size, the arrangement of the text upon the space and the use
of decorations and or punctuation in the text. While this evidence does not allow one to
reconstruct the monumental landscape to the extent that has been possible in the previous
contexts, one can nonetheless observe the changes in the appearance of the monumental
dedications over time.

Surviving Hellenistic and early Augustan monumental inscriptions from the Theatre,
similar to those observed in the Tetragonos Agora (e.g the dedications of the waterclock
and the Arch of Mazeus and Mithridates, Figures 1 and 2, maintain both the formula and appearance of the Hellenistic inscriptions, which are generally without spaces, centralized indentations or variations in letter sizes to underline or illustrate different sections of the text. In the first text, inscribed on one line of an architrave, the large 10 cm letters appear as one indistinguishable block (Figure 18. Drawing of IvE VI. 2031). The fragmentary nature of this inscription, however, does not allow further interpretation. The second text, probably a later inscription from the Augustan era, is complete and offers a more definitive comparison with other Late Hellenistic/Early Augustan inscriptions (Figure 19. Drawing of IvE VI. 2033).

Hieron Aristogiton, son of Hieron, the son of Hieron, sacred and Augustus loving prytanis, set up a vaulted entranceway from his own money (dedicated) to the Demos.

This text, inscribed across an archivolt, could easily have been arranged with line breaks so that the benefactor’s name, his titles and the verbs of dedication would have been broken by the architectural space. Instead the words are thrown together in a jumble, with the titles split over two lines and the verb of dedication cut between the second and third line. There is no attempt to set the benefactor apart from the objects dedicated and the only hint of a space occurs in the last line between the verb of dedication and the recipient. This very basic representation of the Greek message, like the Greek inscriptions of Mazeus and Mithridates’ arch, present a considerable challenge for the literate (few of whom were likely to linger in a crowded passage), and no discernable message for those without experience in reading this form of writing.

---

77 IvE VII.1 3004 and 3006 (respectively)
78 IvE VI. 2031: 1 [οδείμα ... γενομένον ιερεύ] Ἄριστογίτων αγνο[ι] φιλοσεβαστοί πρυτανεύσαι τὴν θψυλίδα κατασκευή.
3 αὐτῷ ἐνθέω τῶν ἰδιῶν τῶν δημο] ἦμ到期.

Hieron Aristogiton, son of Hieron, sacred and Augustus loving prytanis, set up a vaulted entranceway from his own money (dedicated) to the Demos.

IvE VI. 2035: 1 [οδείμα ... γενομένον ιερεύ] Ἄριστογίτων αγνο[ι] φιλοσεβαστοί πρυτανεύσαι τὴν θψυλίδα κατασκευή. 'The great and...having become a Priest of Rome and agono]θ[ε[e for the Dionysia, during which time, in his greatness] he [undertook the repair ?] of the pro[scenium.....\]'.

79 IvE VI. 2035
Flavian and Trajanic dedications: damnatio memoriae revisited

A series of monumental dedications from the late first/early second century AD (ca. 75-100 years later), however, show fundamental changes in the display of Greek writing. These inscriptions, which survive primarily in the form of fragments, record several renovations to the stage building as well as extensions of seating areas, which transformed an earlier Greek style theatre into one which reflected the latest in Roman architectural elements including a lavishly aediculated three storey stage building and a series of new seating wedges with vaulted entranceways (Figure 20. Reconstruction of the Stage building at Ephesus). The first two projects appear to have been financed by the polis and demos in AD 86 and 92 (respectively). The later project (ca. AD 102-112) was the work of Titus Flavius Montanus, a benefactor of whom little else is known. These dedications, carved on monumental architraves, show the extent to which the representation of Greek was altered even in a context which did not have an immediate juxtaposition with Latin monumental writing. Moreover, the first two projects, undertaken by the city and its people, show that it was not only grateful freedmen, Roman citizens or aspiring local aristocrats who chose to embrace a change in the monumental formula. Changes in the representation of Greek monumental language and the dedicatory formula, similar to those observed in the Tetragonos and State Agoras, suggest that such alterations were universal throughout the urban landscape at Ephesus.

The first of two dedications, part of a fundamental reconstruction of the Theatre, dates to the reign of Domitian and are contemporary with numerous projects undertaken by the polis and the demos at this time. Both inscriptions show the adoption of the ‘Imperial formula’ as well as the use of the spaces, marks and decorations, to present a more articulate version of the Greek text. The first dedication was inscribed with large 8 cm letters on an architrave above the first story of the stage building. Although the

80 IvE VI. 2034, 2035 and 2037
81 cf. note 78. T. Flavius Montanus: PIR² F 323. Statue bases naming his offices are IvE VI. 2061-2063.
82 IvE VII.1 3008 (paving of the Embolos) and IvE II. 413-419A (waterworks from the State Agora) record projects undertaken by the polis and/or demos during Domitian’s reign.
dedication survives in fragments, the high standard of preservation and the formulaic nature of the text allow for a reconstruction of the inscription and the appearance of the monument in the form of drawings made by the Austrian team (Figure 21. Drawing of IvE VI. 2034). In the fragments of the drawing provided, one can see that stop marks and spaces have been used to indicate the emperor’s years in various offices, which was integral for dating the dedication. In addition, a space has been added between the objects dedicated and the verb κατέσκευαν. What cannot be observed as a result of the fragmentary nature of this inscription, however, is more clearly illustrated by the second dedication, which has survived in a more complete form. This inscription, recording the addition of a northern wing to the Theatre (including buttresses and passageways) was carved on an architrave from the north wing of the auditorium in large (11-12 cm) letters (Figure 22. Drawing of IvE VI. 2035).

This drawing shows a series of changes in addition to the use of the ‘Imperial formula’. Like so many inscriptions in this survey, line breaks have been used to separate different sections of the inscription. An indentation in the second line not only signals more titles, but has been aligned in such a way that the emperor’s title Imperator (Autokrator in the Greek) and his holding of the imperium (autokratori) are juxtaposed almost directly beneath one another on the first two lines. Stop marks are used, as in the text above, between the emperor’s titles as well as the numbers of times he has held these offices. Moreover, a further mark has been used in the third line, between the verb of dedication and the last section of the inscription regarding the overseer of the project. It is worth noting that many but not all stop marks are used in sections of the text which invoke Imperial (and in this case one might safely say ‘Roman’) aspects of the inscription.

These Flavian dedications provide further insight to monumental implications of damnatio memoriae on epigraphic materials. In contrast to the examples of this practice on bases in the State Agora, the erasure of names on a monumental building dedication,
which fell directly in the line of vision across the stage building, was an especially prominent statement, which would have been seen by all members of the community including many foreigners, who traveled to the city for festivals. What sets these dedications apart is the new image and monumental message which was created by erasing the emperor’s name.\textsuperscript{85} While the appearance of the original text set the emperor in a prominent position second only to Ephesian Artemis, the removal of the emperor’s name within the new ‘Imperial formula’ (evident in Neronian and Domitanic dedicatory inscriptions and statue bases throughout the city)\textsuperscript{86} undercut the power and permanence (some might say divinity) of the emperor. The removal of a name left an ostensible gap of marred stone, which was a constant reminder of the fickle nature of imperial power. The result was not only a monumental blemish but a juxtaposition between the image of imperial power and the power of the local goddess, the \textit{polis} and the \textit{demos} (the dedicators), whose authority were not subject to the whim of the Senate. Therefore, the adoption of the ‘Imperial formula’ was not beneficial as a purely ‘Roman’ trait in epigraphy; on the contrary, it served in many cases to support a local agenda (e.g Artemis, the \textit{polis} and the \textit{demos}). As usual, the representation \textit{damnatio memoriae} in its published format does not fully reflect the monumental reality of the inscription, especially in terms of what was seen by a broader audience.

The third dedication from this context (\textit{ca}. AD 102-112), contemporary with Salutaris’ famous foundation,\textsuperscript{87} is also fragmentary and, as a result, is more difficult in terms of restoration and observing marks and decorations. Its appearance across the archivolt, like the earlier Augustan text, shows an adoption of the new formula and a new sense of hierarchy, conveyed by the differing letter sizes (\textbf{Figure 23. Drawing of IvE VI. 2037}).\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{85} \textit{IvE} VI. 2034 and 2035. This element of monumental epigraphy at Ephesus will be examined further in a forthcoming article.

\textsuperscript{86} Monumental inscriptions with erasure of imperial names include: (Nero) \textit{IvE} Ia. 20; II. 410 and 411; (Domitian) \textit{IvE} II. 232-41, 414-19; V. 1498; VI. 2034-2035, 2047-48; VII.1 3005, 3008, 3510.1-5.

\textsuperscript{87} Salutaris’ foundation, recorded on the North parados of the theatre, set out the allocation of funds for an elaborate procession of statues in celebration of Artemis’ birthday, dates to AD 108 (Rogers 1991b, 10).

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{IvE} VI. 2037. Text is cited as it appears in \textit{IvE}; abbreviations in line 2 are restorations by D. Knibbe.
To Ephesian Artemis and the Emperor Nerva Trajan Augustus Germanicus Dacicius, pontifex maximus, tribune potestas (?) times, pater patriae, Imperator(?) times, and the neokorate Ephesian Demos Titus Flavius Montanus, twice prefect, high priest of Asia of the sacred dwelling of Koinon of Asia in Ephesus, sebastophant and agnonothete for life, he dedicated the vaulting, arches and niches from his own funds.

The letters of the inscription are large monumental forms, which decrease in size with each line (line 1:14 cm; line 2: 9 cm, lines 3-5: 5.5 cm), focus on two recipients, Ephesian Artemis and the emperor (lines 1-2). The demos, the benefactor, his title and his dedication are recorded in letters one third of the size of the first line. This is a complete reversal of the order and the appearance of the Late Hellenistic/Augustan inscriptions at the theater, though it mirrors the formula of more recent dedications at the Theatre by the polis and demos. Moreover, like Celsus’ monument, two surviving statue bases (far more complete than the dedication) also illustrate fundamental differences in the appearance of the monumental inscriptions, particularly with regard to the use of stop marks, spaces, and decorations. These statues have been found near Montanus’ works and in a more prominent position near the stage building (Figure 24. Drawings of IvE VI. 2061-2).89

These inscriptions, like the Flavian bsaes observed in the State Agora, show numerous modifications to the appearance of the Greek. The largest letters are found at the top of the text, recording the role of the dedicator and the recipient. Stop marks can be seen after boule on Part I, line one, and the verb e}ei
dh
has been indented (with decorative bars (Part II line 2) to signify the end of this section. Cognomina for both men have been abbreviated and are followed by a stop mark. Moreover, as in Latin dedications, the filiations have also been marked and abbreviated for Lentulus (Part I. line 3). The number of times Montanus held his office has also been marked, as we have seen in

89 KΕ VI. 2061-2063. Two statues have been built into the south buttress and were probably positioned by the vaulted stairways (IvE VI. 2061-2062). The other statue base was found near the stage (IvΕ VI. 2063).
Domitianic dedications at the Theatre (Part II, line 4) and recording of Aristion’s titles on Celsus’ library. Further stop marks can be seen throughout the inscription (Part I, line 6, Part II lines 11, 12, 16) and decorations such as *hastae* marks and arabesques at the margins of the text (Part II, line 17 and line 23) have been used to delineate different sections of the text (who decreed the monument, to whom the was dedicated and from whence the funds came). The text, which is long and fragmentary, will not receive further discussion. The most fundamental aspect of this monument is the not the detailed list of offices, but the way in which the text has been represented to a broader audience in terms of clarity and aesthetics. Similar aspects of organization, indentation and decoration can also be observed on at least two other statue dedications to Montanus from the Theatre.\(^9\)

The representation of Greek monumental dedications in the Theatre demonstrate a similar development in formula and appearance of inscriptions from the Late Hellenistic/ Early Augustan period to the 2\(^{nd}\) century AD to that observed in the Tetragonos Agora and the State Agora at Ephesus. The Flavian period dedications, especially, illustrate how the image of an inscription could be changed through the use of decorations, spaces, letter sizes and arrangement of the text as well as subsequent acts upon stone. These dedications, set forth by the *polis* and *demos*, show that it was not only private benefactors (such as Roman citizens or freedmen) but also local civic groups who adopted the aforementioned new elements in the monumental appearance of a dedication. Moreover, the existence of comparable developments at the Theatre, which has no known Latin monumental precedents, suggests that this process was neither limited to nor a direct result of the appearance of Latin inscriptions in the immediate context. The inscriptions and the context at the Theatre, which are not as well preserved as those in the two previously discussed contexts (the Tetragonos and the State Agoras), are perhaps more akin to the epigraphic counterparts throughout the Roman Empire in terms of the amount of information they provide for the archaeologist and the epigrapher. As such, it has been particularly important in this context to establish how the assessment of an inscription’s monumentality with the new criteria can be used to create a better understanding of its presentation to the ancient viewer even with limited materials. The

\(^9\) *Ke* VI. 2062-2063.
The question that is raised by the Theatre to what extent the developments in monumental appearance of Greek inscriptions at Ephesus can be observed throughout the Eastern Empire. This question, which requires a far more lengthy response, will be explored briefly below in a sample study of Aphrodisias.

**Part III. Conclusions:**

*Changes in monumental appearance at Ephesus and beyond*

The analysis of developments in the representation of monumental Greek writing from the late 1st century BC to the mid 2nd century AD has shown significant changes in the appearance of inscriptions in the urban contexts of Ephesus. From Augustan Greek dedications at Ephesus, which do not present a visibly articulate statement (especially in comparison with their Latin counterparts) to dedications in the Flavian and Trajanic periods, which make increasing use of textual organization, letter size and architectural space to accentuate aspects of the monumental message (e.g. different roles and individuals), one observes an effort to improve the appearance and visibility of the monumental message. These physical characteristics of monumental inscriptions are important factors in understanding the function and meaning of epigraphy in the public context, which can be lost when inscriptions are taken out of their original context or published solely as a text. Whether or not the aforementioned characteristics were viewed as “Roman” in style or inspiration, their use undoubtedly altered the appearance and the accessibility of information to the viewer.

While the ability to read a text was one way of viewing a monumental inscription, the evolution of monumental presentation evident in Greek dedications at Ephesus has shown that reading the text was not the only (nor perhaps the primary) way of discerning a monumental message in the ancient world. Although a minority of the ancient audience would have been able to understand the written language used in inscriptions, the visual representation of language would nonetheless have carried symbolic and cultural significance for the public generally. Whether or not they had Hemeros’ basic knowledge of ‘stone letters,’ all members of the ancient audience would have seen new a
monumental language, a different representation and organization of the language with spaces and abbreviations between words, as well as decorations and the size of the letters (especially in bilingual inscriptions). Additionally, those who could make out a few words or names would note a new hierarchy and order, in which the principal part of the text (often emphasized with larger letters and more prominent space) began with the local deity, the emperor, and the demos followed by the name of the benefactor.

This analysis of monumental Greek inscriptions from numerous urban contexts at Ephesus has illustrated how criteria for assessing monumentality can be used to broaden our understanding of the way inscriptions were presented to the ancient audience. The next logical step is to apply this methodology elsewhere, so as to determine to what extent the observations made at Ephesus may be applicable throughout the Empire. While the scope of this article prohibits such discussion, the availability of on-line publications such as INSAPH allow for, at the very least, a brief comparison between monumental dedications at Ephesus and Aphrodisias, a site which shows similar developments in the representation of Greek monumental language such as spatial arrangement, decoration and use of abbreviations. Before entering into a comparison of epigraphic monumentality, it is worth noting the city of Aphrodisias, unlike Ephesus, was not a metropolis that was considered ‘worth wooing’ by the emperor, but was a comparably small city which showed special loyalty to Rome in a time of need and was therefore granted special status. As such, Aphrodisias did not have the level of interaction that a provincial capital such as Ephesus may have boasted, and is therefore a better guide to what one may expect to find in less ‘Imperial’ cities such as Priene, Miletos, or Nysa.

The following inscriptions are but a sample of numerous dedications from Aphrodisias which support the observations made at Ephesus.

Zoilos’ dedications (ca. 28 BC) at the theater and the temple of Aphrodite, have the same block like arrangement as the Late Hellenistic and Augustan inscriptions observed

---

91 C.f note 8 for other examples of web publications.


93 Reynolds, A&R, 161. All citations can be found on the INSAPH website cf. note 8. Similar traits can be observed in Zoilos’ other dedications at the Temple of Aphrodite (1.2).
at Ephesus (Figures 1, 2, 9, 19 and 20). His dedication at the theater (no. 8.5), inscribed across the architrave of the stage building has no visible spaces or decorations between words (one block offers an exception, but this is a later recarving. In contrast, dedications from the mid first century AD onwards (as will be observed in the theater, the Sebasteion and the South Agora) include spaces, indentations and decorations to clarify the monumental message. The Claudian dedication of the Sebasteion’s south portico (no. 9.25) and the restoration of the Sebasteion (no. 9.1) (1st century AD) show similar arrangement with each of the recipients separated by decorations (stars) and spaces. Dedicators are also distinguished with dolphins (9.25 line 2) and stars or stop marks (9.1) as well as architectural space (9.25: recipient on line 1, dedicators on line 2). The late first century restoration of the Eusebian baths (5.6) has a leaf after the recipient (line 3) and a scroll after the names of the benefactors and their role (lines 13 and 14). A first century AD statue dedication from the theater at Aphrodisias to the demos (no. 8.52) use spaces and stop marks after the recipients (line 2) and the dedicator (line 3) as well as decorations such as a star at the end of the text (no. 8.52 line 6) like those observed in the theater at Ephesus. These dedications, which are but a small selection from the corpus of materials at Aphrodisias, show similar developments in the representation of Greek language, a subject which merits an independent discussion (forthcoming) by the author. In addition, when further information is available from the ongoing work neighboring sites such as Priene, Miletos, Nysa and Magnesia, it will be possible to make broader comparisons.

The new criteria for assessing inscriptions, when used with new online epigraphic resources, offers an unprecedented opportunity to view inscriptions as part of the visual culture and the standardisation of imagery during the Imperial period. This analysis not only provides an example of the limitation of the epigraphic evidence, but it also illustrates the many ways in which monumental inscriptions can be used to enhance our understanding of culture – and of cultural exchange – in the ancient world. The significance of these inscriptions is not simply the fact of their creation but that, as their visual representation became more formulaic, and as they became more ubiquitous, incorporated into numerous media from sculpture and architecture to portraits and coins,
their significance to an ancient audience, in a word, their power, would have been multiplied many times over. It is probably no coincidence that as the number of inscriptions increases throughout the Empire, one also observes a greater uniformity in the formula and organization of inscriptions. Could this increase in the depiction of language, like the depiction of the emperor in portraiture, have resulted in a wider readership? Most certainly, it meant that the role of inscriptions as visual monuments in urban space took on new significance during the Imperial period.