

Zinon PAPAKONSTANTINOU*

Spectator-Athlete Interaction in Ancient Greek Athletics¹

Abstract: Taking SEG 55, 1473 as a starting point, this paper examines the evidence for draws and spectator behavior in Greek athletics. Even though spectators were usually demonstrative and at times even interacted with athletes, it was always at the discretion of the officials of a festival to award a joint victory. Spectator approbation was highlighted in agonistic inscriptions as a token of distinction for late antique victors.

Keywords: Greek athletics; spectator behavior; athletes; officials; festival; agonistic inscriptions.

A recently published third-century AD agonistic inscription from Phaselis commemorates the joint victory (συνστέφ[θεις], l. 1) of an unknown wrestler at the *themis* of Eukratidas.² The editors have reasonably restored a reference to the spectators of the wrestling match (καθώς τὸ π[λῆ]θος ἐπ[ε]βοήσατο) on ll. 2–3. References to sport spectators are few and far between in Greek agonistic inscriptions. Moreover, sport fans receive sparse, and then mostly indirect, attention from literary authors who perhaps inevitably focus on athletes, the true protagonists of athletic contests. Hence the Phaselis inscription constitutes a welcome addition to any attempt to understand sport fan mentalities and behaviors in the ancient world.

The aim of this paper is to re-visit SEG 55, 1473, especially regarding the nature and extent of the crowd's involvement in the process of deciding a joint victory for the two wrestlers. In order to do that, a broader discussion of joint victories and sport spectator attitudes is necessary. Along the way, our discussion will offer some reflections on sport spectatorship in ancient Greek athletics and point to potentially fruitful research themes on the subject.

Sport performances are interactive and socially embedded. From an athlete's perspective a victory or even a satisfactory performance can be self-fulfilling and empowering. But the sporting experience is never complete without the acknowledgement and the feedback of the audience – witness how empty stands are always a cause for complaint from athletes. Sports fans also attain a great deal from their engagement with sport, including opportunities for interaction and communication with other members of their community and the fostering of a sense of identity.

In the ancient world sports of any kind, including Greek-style athletics and gladiatorial contests, were extremely popular. Interstate competitions and many local contests attracted great crowds. Furthermore, similar to most modern languages, Greek and Latin were replete with metaphors deriving from the sporting world – even the early Christian writers who condemned athletics as heathen practices could not escape the use of sports-related language in their writings. All these are tokens of the extent to which acquaintance with sports practices had permeated popular daily discourse in the Greco-Roman world.

* Zinon Papakonstantinou, University of Illinois at Chicago, Department of Classics and Mediterranean Studies, 601 S. Morgan St., 1808 UH (MC 129), Chicago, IL, 60607, USA (zpapak@uic.edu).

¹ This essay is dedicated to the memory of Professor Sencer Şahin whose work on the epigraphy of Asia Minor has enriched our understanding of ancient Greek athletics, especially during the Roman imperial period.

² Adak et al. 2005, 8 no. 5 (= SEG 55, 1473).

Despite the widespread and favorable reception of sport by individuals and communities, relatively little is known about spectators and sport fans in the ancient world. SEG 55, 1473 is a recent addition to this limited *corpus* that allows a rare glimpse into sport crowd dynamics in a local athletic festival of an Asia Minor city during the Late Roman Empire. The spectators are depicted as animated and the editors suggested that the reference to the crowd's acclamation (καθώς τὸ π[λῆ]θος ἐπ[ε]βοήσατο) implies that it was not the judges but the spectators that reached the decision to award a joint victory to the two unknown wrestling finalists.³

In order to evaluate this assertion, a more thorough examination of the evidence for wrestling draws, spectator involvement and the rules governing local festivals is required. The following overview suggests that the spectators at the *themis* of Eucratidas at Phaselis exhibited a behavior that was in keeping with what is known about sport crowds in the ancient Greek world. Overall, there is no reason to believe that in the case of SEG 55, 1473 the final decision for awarding joint victory crowns did not rest with the authorities of the festival. However, it is likely that similarly to other attested cases in Greek athletics, sport spectators at Phaselis were able to exert some pressure on the athletes and the officials of the local *themis*.

Joint and Sacred Victories in Greek Sport

To achieve victory in Greek wrestling an athlete needed to throw his opponent on the shoulders, back or in a prone position three times. More rarely, the bout ended until one of the adversaries conceded victory.⁴ There were detailed and often very technical rules that governed wrestling. The earliest extant set of regulations for an athletic festival, found in a fragmentary sixth-century BC bronze plaque from Olympia, contains prescriptions for wrestling.⁵ Despite the elaborate rules, ancient Greeks did not impose time limits on wrestling matches. In principle, a wrestling bout could last as long as it was necessary in order to settle the contest on the basis of the requirements for victory outlined above.

In practical terms that meant that wrestling bouts could last long. In that respect wrestling was similar to boxing and the pancration, although these events were decided when one of the opponents was unable or unwilling to continue. For both boxing and pancration there are attested cases of bouts that were suspended because nightfall intervened.⁶ No known case of a wrestling match suspended because of nightfall is preserved. This might be a coincidence or the result of the order in which events were contested in ancient athletic festivals. It is believed that in the Olympic games competition for all three “heavy” events (wrestling, boxing, pancration) occurred on the same day.⁷ Wrestling was the least injurious of the three and hence it was perhaps considered less spectacular. In all likelihood the heavy events were contested in the ancient Olympics in the order wrestling–boxing–pancration.⁸ Perhaps it is no coincidence that the only case of an Olympic event that is explicitly mentioned in an honorific inscription as being fought into the night concerns a pancration bout.⁹

One option in overcoming an impasse in protracted combat sport bouts was to declare a draw. The evidence suggests that draws could be declared by referees for a host of reasons, often with the consent of the athletes. Draws are well attested in Greek athletics, especially in the heavy events. The earliest extant description of Greek athletics in Homer's *Iliad* contains evidence for a draw in a wrestling match

³ Adak et al. 2005, 8.

⁴ Poliakoff 1987, 23–25; Golden 2004, 175–176.

⁵ Ebert – Siewert 1999 (= SEG 48, 541).

⁶ Pancration, IvO 54, 1st century AD; boxing, Paus. 8.40.3–5, possibly late 5th century BC.

⁷ Lee 2001, 60–66.

⁸ See the story of Theogenes of Thasos who was too exhausted to fight in the pancration final after winning the boxing, Paus. 6.6.5.

⁹ IvO 54.

fought between Odysseus and Telamonian Ajax in the context of the funeral games of Patroclus.¹⁰ The two Achaean heroes wrestle for a while without anyone having a clear advantage, until they reach a point when the crowd was about to become frustrated. After a final attempt to decide the fight, the organizer and umpire Achilles intervenes and declares a joint victory (νίκη δ' ἀμφοτέροισιν; Hom. Il. 23,736).

Even though a draw could be imposed by the umpires, it is likely that at times the athletes themselves could collude during a match and attempt to reach a draw.¹¹ For instance, Pausanias (8.40.3–5) relates the story of the boxing final of the Nemean games c. 400 BC between Creugas of Epidamnus and Damoxenus of Syracuse. As evening drew near and the two were still fighting, they came to an agreement to allow each other a punch, presumably to decide the victor. Damoxenus struck with open fingers under Creugas' ribs, drove his hand into his abdomen and killed him on the spot. The contest officials expelled Damoxenus from the games for breaking his agreement with Creugas by striking him multiple times (i.e. with open fingers) and awarded the victory to Creugas. For Pausanias the fact that boxers, and perhaps by implication other combat sport athletes as well, could communicate and make arrangements during a fight is taken for granted. In fact, this perception goes back at least to the early Hellenistic period as it is found in a passage in Polybius' *Histories* (Pol. 29.8.9) in which it is claimed that good wrestlers could skilfully arrange a draw.

An arrangement between the athletes could account for some of the joint victories attested in Greek athletics, especially during the Roman imperial period when such shared victories appear with greater frequency. But why would two athletes agree to end a fight in a draw? Even though top-rank athletes scorned the idea of a draw, athletes of regional caliber, especially in the younger age-categories, often proudly commemorated their "joint-crown" or "sacred" victories.¹² Since even in such cases athletes could still reap some of the social capital associated with athletic victory, it is reasonable to assume that in cases of balanced and inconclusive bouts competitors would have been more willing to accede to a draw. Overall, this situation suited many local athletes and contest organizers, since it gave the opportunity to more athletes to partake of the prestige of sports victory, a vital constituent in the construction of a Hellenic cultural identity in the Greek-speaking cities of Roman Asia Minor.¹³ One suspects that such special circumstances can partly explain many of the shared victories attested in agonistic inscriptions of the second and third centuries AD.

Assuming that on certain occasions athletes could come to an agreement to end a fight in a draw the formal and final decision, as in all other cases of awarding a victory, must have rested with the autho-

¹⁰ Hom. Il. 23, 700–739.

¹¹ In such cases of match-fixing by competitors, it was presumably still up to the referees to officially declare a draw. Scholars have assumed that the verb *συνεξέρχουμαι*, usually encountered in agonistic inscriptions in participial form, denotes a draw reached after of a joint decision by the athletes, not by the referees. See Moretti 1953 no. 71; Tanriver 2009, 85; SEG 59, 1404. However, there is no reason to doubt that even in the cases of consensual draws the ultimate responsibility of declaring the outcome of a match rested with the referees. Hence *συνεξελοθέντας* refers to joint victories mutually agreed by the athletes and proclaimed by the referees.

¹² In IG 14 1102, 13–14 = Moretti 1953 no. 79 the famous pancratiast Marcus Aurelius Asclepiades claimed that he never had to share a victory. But other athletes took pride in joint victories. E.g. joint victors in boys' pancration, Ramsay 1888, 12 no. 9 = Bérard 1892, 424 no. 53 Pogle, Pisidia, 3rd century AD; joint victors in boys' wrestling, Woodward – Ormerod 1909/1910, 117 no. 10, Pisidia, imperial era; joint victors in boys' wrestling SEG 2, 745, Pisidia, 3rd/4th centuries AD. There are also recorded draws in running events, e.g. in the men's stadion, I Selge 46, Pisidia, 3rd century AD. For additional references to recorded draws in agonistic inscriptions see Crowther 2000. For a recent addition see SEG 59, 1404.

¹³ For the possibility that shared victories were more readily declared after the 2nd century AD see Moretti 1953, 225 in connection with the honorary inscription for M. Aurelius Hermagoras who recorded 29 shared victories, including one in the Olympics. For the importance of sport in the construction of elite Greek cultural identities in the Roman East see van Nijf 1999; 2001; 2003.

rities of the festival. All athletic contests were governed by a set of regulations. Local contests tended to replicate many features of the program and the administrative structure of the major games.¹⁴ Nevertheless, there was also considerable diversity, e.g. in the events contested and in the age-categories of athletes. That was especially so during the Roman imperial period when the athletic calendar was thronged with hundreds of international and local games. At times agonistic inscriptions make explicit references to the regulations of a contest. For instance, a third century AD honorary decree from Side for an unknown athlete, possibly in one of the combat events, points out that the athlete in question was awarded the victory crown in accordance with the regulations of the local *themis*.¹⁵ Inscriptions containing the regulations of various athletic contests, mostly dating to the Roman period, have survived.¹⁶ They usually prescribe in detail the prizes to be awarded to victors according to age-group and event. Moreover, they frequently regulate several other logistical aspects of the games, e.g. the eligibility of athletes.

It is worth noting however that extant regulations of athletic contests do not contain clauses with technical rules for the various events. Such rules were committed to writing, probably in connection with the major contests of the *periodos*, e.g. the fragment of a late sixth-century inscription containing rules on wrestling from Olympia.¹⁷ Taking their cue from these lists of technical rules that essentially amounted to rulebooks for the various events, athletes and umpires throughout the Greek world followed what was considered common practice. Such universality of technical rules for athletic events was a prerequisite for the development of an international circuit of hundreds of athletic contests frequented by local and itinerant athletes. It also explains the nearly comprehensive lack of provisions for draws or other technical aspects of athletic competition in the surviving regulations of local festivals.¹⁸ Overall, it seems safe to conclude that natural phenomena (e.g. nightfall), precedent and nearly universally enforced written rules determined whether the officials of athletic competitions would declare a draw in an event.

Spectators in Greek Athletics

Late Roman agonistic inscriptions suggest that at times other external factors could have played a role in determining a draw or a victory. IvO 54 is an early first century AD honorific decree proposed by M. Vetulenus Laetus, a nobleman from Elis, concerning the pancratiast Claudius Tiberius Rufus from Smyrna. Laetus recommended the grant of Eleian citizenship to Rufus and requested for permission to set up his victory statue in Olympia.¹⁹ Despite the fact that Olympic victors were normally allowed the privilege to set up their statue in the Altis, Laetus' special pleading was necessary because, as the decree explains, Rufus' victory was achieved in exceptional circumstances. In elaborate language, the decree claims that while taking part in the Olympics Claudius Tiberius Rufus conducted himself in an exemplary fashion in front of the *hellanodikai* during the mandatory training month period that preceded

¹⁴ For regulations of Greek athletic contests in antiquity see in general Papakonstantinou, forthcoming.

¹⁵ ISide II 132.

¹⁶ E.g. IvO 56, regulation of the Sebasta in Naples, 1st–2nd century AD; IG V/1 19, regulation of the Leonidaia in Sparta, early 2nd century AD; IG V/1 20, Leonidaia or unknown annual festival in Sparta, early 2nd century AD; cf. Wörrle 1988 containing the foundation charter and regulations regarding several aspects of the operation of a quadrennial festival in second-century AD Oinoanda.

¹⁷ See n. 4.

¹⁸ The only exception known to me concerns SEG 6, 449 = SEG 39, 1418 = Gardiner 1929, a festival regulation from Misthia, Lykaonia dated no earlier than the second century AD. The regulation prescribes that the pancratiasts who competed in the games in question were not allowed to wrestle and could only fight standing up. These rules were at odds with pancration as commonly practiced which prohibited only gouging and biting.

¹⁹ For a discussion of IvO 54 see Merkelbach 1974; Ebert 1997, 226–227; Crowther 2000, 135–137; Golden 2004, 40.

the contests. Then during the competition Rufus reached the pancration final without a bye and he fought against an unnamed opponent who had enjoyed a bye in one of the previous rounds. The two fought on until night intervened, which would normally lead the *hellanodikai* to declare a draw. But in this case we are told that the sacred victory was awarded solely to Rufus (IvO 54, 37–38 τῆς ἱερᾶς ἦν μόνος ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ἀνδρῶν ἐποίησεν). The reasons behind this decision are unclear but perhaps Rufus’ friends in high places, including Laetus, might had something to do with it. In his honorific inscription the notable late second-century AD pancratiast Marcus Aurelius Asclepiades “Hermodorus” claimed that he never won by imperial favor (IG XIV 1102, 14–15 = Moretti 1953 no. 79, μήτε κατὰ χάριν βασιλικὴν ἀγῶνα ἔχων). Besides being a highly ranked athlete, Claudius Tiberius Rufus was a man of consular status²⁰ and it is likely that he was known even in the imperial household. If this reconstruction holds true, then the role of Laetus in IvO 54 was crucial: by proposing a ψήφισμα μαρτυρικόν he made Rufus’ case known to other power players and thus facilitated the award of Olympic victory honors to the athlete from Smyrna.²¹

An additional factor that might have weighted in the decision to award a sacred victory to Rufus was the crowd’s reaction. In IvO 54, 27–30 it is claimed that because Rufus fought with such endurance and determination all spectators, Eleians as well as others who gathered in Olympia from all parts of the world, greatly admired Rufus’ performance:

ὥστε καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν
 ἡμετέρων καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης θεατῶν
 συνειλεγμένων ἐπὶ τὸν ἱερώτατον τῶν
 Ὀλυμπίων ἀγῶνα θαυμάζεσθαι.

Rufus’ achievement, i.e. to receive no bye, reach the final and then go on and fight in equal terms an opponent who had enjoyed a bye was admirable but hardly unique in the annals of Olympic history. Many sport enthusiasts present in Olympia on the day of Rufus’ fight would have been aware of that fact, especially because athletes of the Roman period were very eager to record in honorific decrees ἀνέφεδρος (“without a bye”) victories or victories won in other exceptional circumstances.²² Hence one suspects that the importance of the crowd’s admiration recorded in IvO 54, even if based on real events, could have been embellished as part of the rhetorical flourish used by Laetus in his attempt to grant Rufus Olympic victor status.

Other evidence also suggests that even though Greek sport spectators were not necessarily always fully conversant with all the technical subtleties of athletic events, they were nevertheless knowledgeable of the basic rules and the history of sport. They were also appreciative of the performative aspects of athletic competitions and were often openly expressive in their support or disapprobation of athletes. Spectators play a key role in the earliest descriptions of Greek athletics in Homer. Especially in the funeral games of Patroclus spectators are depicted as well-informed and engaged (Hom. Il. 23,257–897). The same picture emerges for the archaic, classical and later periods and it is further corroborated by the fact that despite the occasional critic, the evidence suggests that sport was highly regarded by the majority of Greeks throughout antiquity.²³ Sport fans often travelled great distances and endured strenuous conditions to watch the best athletes in the major contests.²⁴ We even know of a certain

²⁰ See IG XIV 1107 which decrees that Rufus’ son inherits the high priesthood.

²¹ See the reconstruction of Merkelbach 1974 who argues for an endorsement by the emperor.

²² Brunet 2011.

²³ For critics of Greek sport see Papakonstantinou 2014. For the popularity of sport, with particular reference to classical Athens, see Pritchard 2013.

²⁴ Epikt. Discourses 1.6.26–28; Ael. VH 14.18; Lucianus, Peregr. 35–36.

Caicilius, a dedicated Olympic fan from 3rd century AD Veroia, who travelled to the Olympics twelve times during his lifetime and proudly recorded the fact in his tombstone.²⁵

Ancient Greek sport audiences did not hesitate to become actively involved in support of their favorite athlete. To be sure, Caicilius and other spectators familiar with the highest level of athletic competition in the *periodos* or in the most renowned local games would have had higher standards and different expectations than the audiences at a local *themis* contests in a small provincial city of the Roman Empire. In the latter case, individuals who did not travel frequently far from their home city for the purpose of attending athletic festivals would have had fewer opportunities to witness high-level athletic performances. Nevertheless, certain patterns of sport spectator behavior do emerge. For instance, in a revealing passage Polybius makes a number of assertions on the psychology and conduct of sport spectators in ancient Greek athletics.²⁶ The passage is worth quoting in full:

“When some obscure and far inferior opponent is pitted against a notable and invincible athlete, the spectators immediately bestow their favor upon the weaker of the two, and try to keep up his spirits, and eagerly second his efforts by their enthusiasm. And if he succeeds so far as even to touch the face of his opponent, and make a mark to prove the blow, the whole of the spectators again show themselves on his side. Sometimes they even jeer at his antagonist, not because they dislike or undervalue him, but because their sympathies are roused by the unexpected, and they are naturally inclined to take the weaker side. But if any one checks them at the right moment, they are quick to change and see their mistake.”

To prove his point, Polybius goes on to describe an incident that allegedly took place during the Olympic boxing final of 212 BC. That fight featured Cleitomachus of Thebes, boxing Olympic champion of 216 BC and admittedly one of the most notable combat sport athletes of his day. His opponent was Aristonicus from Egypt, a talented but most likely relatively unknown athlete who, Polybius argues, was sponsored by king Ptolemy IV Philopator with the goal of defeating the formidable Cleitomachus. Aristonicus advanced all the way to the final and, as expected, he faced Cleitomachus. Polybius maintains that initially most spectators became increasingly vocal in favor of the underdog Aristonicus, especially since the athlete from Egypt put up a good fight against the favorite. At that point Cleitomachus addressed the crowd and asked them if they realized that he, a Theban, was fighting for the glory of Greece whereas Cleitomachus represented Egypt and king Ptolemy. Ostensibly that put the crowd to shame. They shifted their support to Cleitomachus and he won the match and the Olympic crown.²⁷

One should beware not to generalize on the basis of Polybius' observations. However, the limited evidence on the subject concurs with Polybius in suggesting that spectators in Greek athletic contests were quite demonstrative in their reactions. For instance, in the Homeric funeral games for Patroclus Idomeneus from Crete and Ajax son of Oileus from Locris have an altercation and are ready to wager over the question of who was leading the four-horse chariot race (Hom. Il. 23,450–489). Among later sources, Possidipus (AB 74) describes how, following a tight race, the crowd's favorable reaction was critical in awarding the *tethrippon* Pythian crown of 274 or 270 BC to Callicrates. Aelian (VH 2.6) argued that sport crowds were eager to cheer their favorite athletes even if they did not always gauge the technical subtleties of sport. Moreover, Dio Chrystostom describes, in an exaggerated and hostile manner, wildly animated sport spectators in Alexandria.²⁸ Dio, along with Polybius in the passage discussed above, attribute the vivacious reactions of sport spectators to what they perceived as the irrational and mercurial psychology of the masses, a view that partly derived from elitist stereotypes over the lower

²⁵ Gounaropoulou – Hatzopoulos 1998 no. 398.

²⁶ Pol. 27.9.3–6.

²⁷ Pol. 27.9.7–13.

²⁸ Dion Chrys. 32.41–42.

social orders.²⁹ However, even such slanted views presuppose a vivid engagement of audiences with athletes and sport performances. The evidence even suggests that in certain cases fans of ancient athletes exhibited what is today dubbed “parasocial interaction”, i.e. a one-sided relationship where the fan is well-informed of the sport achievements and other aspects of life of an athlete or other celebrity.³⁰

In light of the above discussion, and despite Laetus’ biased agenda, it is plausible that the crowd in Olympia threw their weight behind Rufus’ efforts in the pancratium Olympic final as described in IvO 54. The same can be argued regarding the reference to the crowd in SEG 55, 1473, the inscription from Phaselis with which we began our discussion. The enthusiastic cheering of the spectators of the wrestling final at the *themis* of Eukratidas should be understood in the context of a long tradition of sport fandom and spectatorship in the ancient Greek world. Even though the decision to award a joint victory at the games in Phaselis formally rested with the contest umpires, the audience’s response and the spectators-athletes interaction were additional factors that local *agonothetai* and other officials could not easily overlook.

Conclusion

SEG 55, 1473 provides a rare epigraphical attestation of spectator attitudes and behavior in ancient Greek athletics. Spectators could not by themselves decide the outcome of a race or fight, but very often they could sway the opinion of officials. In all likelihood, it is exactly such a moment that is recorded in the inscription from Phaselis. Most known instances of outspoken spectator support concern events contested in one of the major inter-state contests. The Phaselis inscription allows a glimpse of the interaction between spectators and athletes at the local level. It is noteworthy that whereas literary authors at times castigate spectator reactions, epinician inscriptions present spectator intervention, especially if such an intervention contributed in deciding a victory or a draw, as an acknowledgement of a superb athletic performance. In that sense, references in agonistic inscriptions to active spectator support were meant to be understood as tokens of distinction, similar to other achievements (e.g. winning without a bye) that athletes of the Roman imperial period so eagerly recorded and propagated.

Bibliography

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Adak et al. 2005 | M. Adak – N. Tüner Önen – S. Şahin, Neue Inschriften aus Phaselis I, <i>Gephyra</i> 2, 2005, 1–20. |
| Barry 1993 | W. D. Barry, Aristocrats, Orators, and the “Mob”: Dio Chrysostom and the World of the Alexandrians, <i>Historia</i> 42, 1993, 82–103. |
| Bérard 1892 | V. Bérard, <i>Inscriptions d’Asie Mineure</i> , BCH 16, 1892, 417–446. |
| Brunet 2011 | S. Brunet, Living in the Shadow of the Past: Greek Athletes During the Roman Empire, in: Barbara Goff – Michael Simpson (eds.), <i>Thinking the Olympics: The Classical Tradition and the Modern Games</i> , London 2011, 90–108. |
| Crowther 2000 | N. B. Crowther, Resolving an Impasse: Draws, Dead Heats and Similar Decisions in Greek Athletics, <i>Nikephoros</i> 13, 2000, 125–140. |
| Earnhardt – Haridakis 2009 | A. C. Earnhardt – P. M. Haridakis, An Examination of Fan-Athlete Interaction: Fandom, Parasocial Interaction, and Identification, <i>Ohio Communication Journal</i> 47, 2009, 27–53. |

²⁹ Cf. Pol. 27.10.1 in which the Polybius compares the crowd reaction in the Cleitomachus vs Aristonicus bout with the reaction of the multitude (περὶ τοὺς ὄχλους) towards the initial successes of Perseus during the third Macedonian war. For the description of Alexandrian sport spectators behavior in Dio see Barry 1993.

³⁰ For parasocial interaction between fans and athletes in the ancient world see e.g. P. Pyth. 10, 58–60 where the victor is presented as admired by young men and the elders and as an object of erotic desire for girls of his city; similarly, a first century AD gladiator in Pompeii was a favorite among female fans, ILS 5142 a–e = CIL IV 4356 = Hunink 2011 no. 338. For parasocial interaction between fans and athletes or other celebrities see Horton – Wohl 1956; Earnhardt – Haridakis 2009; Frederick et al. 2012.

- Ebert 1997 J. Ebert, Zur neuen Bronzeplatte mit Siegerinschriften aus Olympia (Inv. 1148), *Nikephoros* 10, 1997, 217–233.
- Ebert – Siewert 1999 J. Ebert – P. Siewert, Eine archaische Bronzeurkunde aus Olympia mit Vorschriften für Ringkämpfer und Kampfrichter, in: A. Mallwitz (ed.), Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia XI, Berlin 1999, 391–412.
- Frederick et al. 2012 Evan L. Frederick – C. H. Lim – G. Clavio – P. Walsh, Why We Follow: An Examination of Parasocial Interaction and Fan Motivations for Following Athlete Archetypes on Twitter, *International Journal of Sport Communication* 5, 2012, 481–502.
- Gardiner 1929 E. N. Gardiner, Regulations for a Local Sports Meeting, *CR* 43, 1929, 210–212.
- Golden 2004 M. Golden, *Sport in the Ancient World from A to Z*, London – New York 2004.
- Gounaropoulou – Hatzopoulos 1998 L. Gounaropoulou – M. Hatzopoulos, *Επιγραφές κάτω Μακεδονίας (Μεταξύ του Βερμίου όρους και του Αξιού ποταμού)*. Τεύχος Α'. *Επιγραφές Βεροίας*. Athens 1998.
- Horton – Wohl 1956 D. Horton – R. R. Wohl, Mass Communication and Para-social Interaction: Observations on Intimacy at a Distance, *Psychiatry* 19.3, 1956, 215–229.
- Hunink 2011 V. Hunink, *Glücklich ist dieser Ort! 1000 Graffiti aus Pompeji*, Stuttgart 2011.
- Lee 2001 H. M. Lee, *The Program and Schedule of the Ancient Olympic Games*, Hildesheim 2001.
- Merkelbach 1974 R. Merkelbach, Der unentschiedene Kampf des Pankratiasten Ti. Claudius Rufus in Olympia, *ZPE* 15, 1974, 99–104.
- Moretti 1953 Luigi Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*. Rome 1953.
- Papakonstantinou 2014 Z. Papakonstantinou, Ancient Critics of Greek Sport, in: P. Christesen – D. Kyle (eds.), *A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Chichester and Malden 2014, 320–331.
- Papakonstantinou, forthcoming Z. Papakonstantinou, Law, Litigation and Sport in Ancient Greece, forthcoming in: T. Scanlon – A. Futrell (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*, Oxford – New York.
- Poliakoff 1987 M. B. Poliakoff, *Combat Sports in the Ancient world: Competition, Violence and Culture*, New Haven 1987.
- Pritchard 2013 D. M. Pritchard, *Sport, Democracy and War in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 2013.
- Ramsay 1888 W. M. Ramsay, Antiquities of Southern Phrygia and the Border Lands (II), *AJA* 4, 1888, 6–21.
- Tanriver 2009 C. Tanriver, Three New Inscriptions from Tripolis, *EA* 42, 2009, 81–86.
- van Nijf 1999 O. van Nijf, Athletics, Festivals and Greek Identity in the Roman East, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 45, 1999, 176–200.
- van Nijf 2001 O. van Nijf, Local Heroes: Athletics, Festivals and Elite Self-fashioning in the Roman East, in: S. Goldhill (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge – New York 2001, 306–334.
- van Nijf 2003 O. van Nijf, Athletics, *andreia* and the *askêsis*-culture in the Roman East, in: R. M. Rosen – I. Sluiter (eds.), *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden 2003, 263–286.
- Woodward – Ormerod 1909/1910 A. M. Woodward – H. A. Ormerod, A Journey in South-Western Asia Minor, *ABSA* 16, 1909/1910, 76–136.
- Wörrle 1988 M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*, Munich 1988.

Özet

Eski Yunan Atletizminde Seyirci-Atlet Etkileşimi

Yazar makalesinde Phaselis'ten İ.S. 3. Yüzyıla tarihlenen agonistik bir yazıttan (SEG 55, 1473) yola çıkarak, festivallerde seyircilerin tutum ve davranışlarını incelemektedir. Sporcu müsabakalarını izleyen seyircilere yönelik yazıtların oldukça az olması, edebi kaynakların daha ziyade sporculara, yarışmalara değinmeleri nedeniyle Antik Dönem'de sporseverlerin düşünce yapılarını ve davranışlarını anlamak güç olduğu için Phaselis yazıtı gibi kısıtlı sayıda yazıt bu nedenle önem arz etmektedir. Yazar, bu yazıt üzerinden berabere sonuçlanan müsabakalarda seyircilerin bu karar karşısında tutumunun nasıl olduğunu ve Antik Dönem atletizminde spor seyirciliğinde yansımaları tartışmaya sunmaktadır. Seyircilerin kendi kendilerine yarışmada alınan sonuçlara hüküm veremedikleri ama çoğunlukla da yarışmada görev alan memurların kararını etkilemeye, akıllarını çelmeye çalıştıkları bilinmektedir. Phaselis yazıtında da benzer durumlar çok büyük bir olasılıkla yer almaktaydı.

Anahtar sözcükler: Yunan atletizmi; seyirci davranışı; atletler; memurlar; bayram; agonistik yazıtlar.