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NOTES ON GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

**Messene**

A statue base excavated at Messene honors Damostratos of Sparta, who has brought about the reconciliation of the two cities, traditional enemies:  

\[ \text{ἀθάνατον} \text{μ⟨ν⟩άμ⟨α⟩ν} \text{ἀρετᾶς}, \text{∆αμόστρατε}, \text{λε[ιπείς]} \]  
\[ \text{ἀρχαίαν ἔχθραν ἐς φιλίαν ἀγαγών}, \]  
\[ \text{σὰν πατρίδα Σπάρταν καὶ Μεσ⟨σ⟩άνα⟨ν} \text{ὁμαλί[σαι]} \]  
\[ \text{πολλῶν εὐξαμένων, σοὶ τόδε νεῖμε Τύ[χη].} \]

Damostratos, you leave an Immortal memorial of your excellence, you who steered an ancient hatred to friendship. Though many had prayed to make equal your fatherland Sparta and Messene, Fortune allotted this to you.

The editor has plausibly connected the monument with the events of 210 B.C., the emergence of the anti-Macedonian alliance that included Messene and Sparta.

The problem is the verb in line 3. ὁμαλίζω is relentlessly quantitative, to “make equal”: one “levels” a piece of ground or a block of stone (e.g. Theophr. Plant. 5.9.8), also streets (“graded”, we would say, for a procession: IG III 2 380.22, ὀμαλισθῶσιν καὶ κατασκευασθῶσιν ὡς βέλτιστο). Metaphorically, one can “flatten” one’s emotions (LSJ cite Arist. Pol. 1266b30, cf. Xen. Oec. 18.5). But to level a city (LSJ cite Isoc. 5.40, cities “flattened by disasters”; again 6.65) is no favor. “Make equal” in the sense of “reconcile” (Thémélis: “améliorer la relation de la patrie Sparte avec Messène”) does not seem a possible meaning. Nor will ὁμαλίσαι scan.

The published photographs suggest at the end of line 3 that ΔΕ is as likely as ΛΙ. Restore then ὁμαδέ[λφους]: “many had prayed that your fatherland Sparta and Messene (be) brothers”. The adjective is rare in the authors but on good record in poems on stone, from the fourth century B.C. (FD III.4 460.3) to the fourth A.D. (SEG 43, 943.B.iii). The intensifying ὀμ- is seen e.g. in the poetic ὀμήγυρις for πανήγυρις (e.g. I.Cret. I viii 33.10) and once in ὀμοπολιτεία for συμπολιτεία (IG XII.4 170.16).

The absence of an infinitive (εἶναι vel sim.) with εὐξαμένων is a discomfort. One can “pray for” a thing with a bare accusative (e.g. Anth.Gr. 11.65, εὔχετο γραῦν … εὔχετο λιμόν). LSJ offer examples of a double accusative without εἶναι, but only with εὔχομαι meaning “boast”. But an epigram from Lesbos (GV I 309), though with one accusative, offers an expression even more elliptical than at Messene: τὴν κύνα Λεσβιακῆι βωλῶι ὑπεθήκατο Βάλβος / εὐξάμενος κούφην τῆι κατὰ γῆς σκύλοις, “Balbus buried his dog in Lesbos’ soil, having prayed (that it be) light on the hound beneath the earth”.

**Boeotia**

A fragmentary inscription was copied by Lolling in the museum of Thebes; in his drawing, the ornate letters with split serifs point to a late Hellenistic or early Imperial date. The text was restored by Dittenberger (IG VII 2492):

\[ \text{Γναῖ[ον Πομπήιον Γναῖου]} \]  
\[ \text{ὑίον Μ[έγαν} \]  
\[ \text{χήσαν[τα καὶ – – – – – – –].} \]


2 1 MAMNAP, 3 ΜΕΣΑΝΑΩΜ lap.; the mason evidently was careless, and Thémélis’ emendations are compelling. The error μήμνης for μνήμης is in a late text from Egypt: SEG 30, 1737. Also possible: 1 Δαμόστρατε, ἐλεί[πείς], 4 τόδε ἐνεμέ.


4 Especially if we discount Theodore of Studius, who was unaccountably fond of it.
The end of the first line need not be the unexampled ἔφυες. The photograph shows traces including the lower parts of three hastas, and seems to allow at the end the CE as well as EC, the ending of an aorist verb. Possibly the girl’s father “engendered” (ἔφυες) her noble mind. But ἔφυες, like ἔφυες, would not scan; and, more compelling, δ’ αὐτῇ implies that νόον is the second object of the verb in this sentence. Perhaps then unaugmented γέμῃ. Virtues/vices or emotions might “fill” a person or a mind. On that theory, some

Pharsalus

A funerary epigram for a woman at Pharsalus in Thessaly, dated late II/early III A.D., was first published by A. Tziaphalias and then by J.-C. Decourt. The latter gave a text and tentative translation:

πέδοις Νείλο(υ) χ[ι[λο]ρος τ’ ἔφυες;
κοιρῆς δ’ αὐτῇ φίλας’ ἐσθλὸν
νόον οὖνεκα πάσσας νείκης
ἐνγαμέτας σώφροσιν ἄνφι τρόποις.

... tu grandissais dans les plaines et les pays du Nil; ensuite il chérit le noble coeur d’une jeune fille, puisque tu l'emportes sur toutes les épouses du fait de ta sage conduite.

A new sentence must begin with υάνεκα:

πέδοις, ἔφυες, and νείκης ἐνγαμέτας are hardly Greek, and φίλας’ cannot easily yield a verb. Tziaphalias had offered a credible text: in 1, Ἄνδρος ἐν διαβόρροις; in 2, the adjective φίλας; in 3–4, the verb νείκης (approved by Pleket in SEG). A. and M. Kontogiannis (in SEG) saw that line 1 has Νείλο(υ)[Ρ]ύτος.

A new sentence must begin with υάνεκα: “and so she surpassed all the matrons because of her sober ways” – high praise for a teen-aged girl, probably unmarried (for the sentiment cf. I. Ankara p. 413). What preceded this is more difficult to reconstruct. In that sentence, νόον was the object of some preceding verb, one appropriate to affecting a mind. Hades should not be restored here, as his fields are not watered by the Nile.

The end of the first line need not be the unexampled ἔφυες. The photograph shows traces including the lower parts of three hastas, and seems to allow at the end the CE as well as EC, the ending of an aorist verb. Possibly the girl’s father “engendered” (ἔφυες) her noble mind. But ἔφυες, like ἔφυες, would not scan; and, more compelling, δ’ αὐτῇ implies that νόον is the second object of the verb in this sentence. Perhaps then unaugmented γέμῃ. Virtues/vices or emotions might “fill” a person or a mind. On that theory, some

Thus, Dittenberger saw the participles cannot indicate offices that were held by Pompey. He considered that they must describe him as bestowing some benefactions; these however he could not imagine or restore.

The name of the dedicator apparently was on a separate block, and so the last word restored is arbitrary. Rather, this monument was for a Greek, a local man named M– (Μιήνονα vel sim.) who had gained Roman citizenship through a Roman Gnaius –. His name would be of the pattern T. Φιλάουνον Φιλέινον υών Μόνδωνα (Roesch, I.Thespiae 378; I A.D.). There will then be several possibilities for his offices, e.g. Boeotarch for the first. Perhaps the most likely restoration would be γυμνασιαρ(χήσαν[τα καὶ ἄγορανομ]φαντα (cf. I.Thespiae 361). Whatever the offices, we lose Pompey and a narrow date for the monument; we gain a Boeotian dignitary possessed of Roman citizenship at a relatively early date.


6 A. Tziaphalias, Deltion 43B (1988) 283; J.-C. Decourt, I.Thess. I 105 (who does not seem to have consulted the first edition) adds a photograph and the reading of the end of line 1 (Tziaphalias: Νείλον - - - [SEG 43, 301 with corrections]).

7 Philo Spec.Leg. 4.129 has persons “filled with piety”, γεμισθέντας ἐυσεβείας; 2.46 with καλοκἀγαθίας; Migr.Abr. 36 περιλαμβάνει νόον; Somm. 2.296 ψυχή ... γέμουσα ἀλαζονείας; 3 Macce. 5.47 ὀργὴ βαγεμένη γεμισθεὶς δυσσεβῆ φρένα; Ach. Tat. 6.19.5 ὁ θυμὸς καχλάζων γεμισθένης (cf. 5.1.1, her beauty filled my eyes with pleasure, μου τούς ὀφθαλμούς ἐγέμισεν ἰδονής); John Chrysos. Hom. 19 (PG 49.190) τὸ νοήμα τίτους πολλῆς γέμῃ σοφίας. Persons filled (γέμω) with χαράσων at
sentiment or virtue (e.g. εὐσεβίη, σοφίη) filled her parent(s) (e.g. τοὺς τε γονεῖς) in the Nile-watered fields, and then too the noble mind of the daughter now deceased.

As to φίλας in line 2: “dear child” is an obvious phrase and familiar, but the stark linking of Ionic κούρης and Doric φίλας is jarring. Occasionally we find φίλα in epigrams which elsewhere have also culled Ionic forms from the old poets (e.g. IG UrbRom III 1379, Anth.Gr. 5.172); but what can best hold its form against a dialectic context is a proper name. Thus a Syrian epitaph affects Doric throughout, except in the women's names: αδε πολυθρήνητος ἐπέφθιτο ματέρι κούρα / Παμφίλη, daughter of Ερμιόνη. In the Pharsalus poem, the well-attested personal name Φίλα would be unproblematic: “the noble mind of their child Phila”.

Thus, in metrical lines:

[δαιπέδους Νείλο[ρύτοις γέμισε]?,
κούρης δ' αὐτε Φίλας ἐσθλὸν νόον' οὖνεκα πάσας
νείκησεν γαμετας σώφροσιν ἁνφί τρόποις.

The inscription is reported to be in a tabula ansata on a block found ca. 1965 reused in the wall of a church in Pharsalus. The photograph shows that the writing has been squeezed into one portion of the slab. In 1805, Leake saw “inserted in the wall of the Greek church in Pharsalus” an inscription carved in a tabula ansata. That stone is long lost; the text is in fact the next item in I.Thess. I:

Ἀυρ. Φίλα παρανγέλλι παν-
tί φάθινοτε μετά το αὐτήν
τεθήνε την ληνὸν
μηδε ἀνύξε ἐπερὼν
το ἐων: εϊ δε μη, o - - -

Aurelia Phila announces to everyone that after her burial in the sarcophagus no one else is to open it ever; otherwise - - -

We can suspect that this was the same church and that its construction or decoration included spolia from an ancient tomb. I suggest that this is another piece of the same sarcophagus and the deceased is the same Phila. The dates are not inconsistent. The prose text with Aur., Phila's injunction, is later than A.D. 212. The epitaph lacks the Caracallan nomen, but Phila's full legal name need not have been exhibited in the poem. Apparently she had moved to Thessaly from Egypt, a land proverbial for piety and for wisdom.

Rhodes

A man on Rhodes had a vision of a chthonic spirit, to whom he then dedicated an altar. The stone, in the Rhodes museum without provenance, was read:

Ἱέρων
Δεισιθέμιος κατὰ τὸ ὅραμα
"Ἡρώι.
The father’s name Deisithemis, apparently unparalleled, is disquieting. The similar formation Δεισιθέος, “god-fearing” is attested and unproblematic; θεοδείς is a term of praise as old as Homer. By contrast, a personal name “afraid of law” might strike an odd and even ominous note.

In the published photograph, the stroke that was taken as the bottom of delta is sloping and thinly cut, in a text otherwise quite regular: this stroke should be reckoned a random scratch, and so the letter is lambda. To its left is damage: the upper surface appears lost, while the strokes below might be either the lower half of kappa or random scratches. Write conservatively [Κ]λεισθέος. The name Kleisithemis is found of several men at Lindos and one on Telos under Rhodian rule,\textsuperscript{14} as the LGPN signals. I have found it nowhere else; Hieron and his father were Lindians. A Kleisithemis on Telos may support Hiller’s idea that Telos was attributed to Lindos.\textsuperscript{15}

Much the same unease is raised by the name Deisippos, reported once: Λέωντος Δεισιππείοι at Larisa in Thessaly.\textsuperscript{16} Would a Thessalian name his son “afraid of horses”? The stone was described by Kern as hard to read.\textsuperscript{17} One thinks instead of better-attested names, Deinippos or even Ageisippos, Δεισιππείοι / Ἀγεισιππείοι.

Chios

A decree of the Ionian League in 289/8 B.C. honoring a courtier of Lysimachus has been known since the nineteenth century from two copies, inscribed at the member-cities Smyrna and Miletus. A third copy has now been rectified by Georg Petzl, an inscription on Chios.\textsuperscript{18} The courtier has been, until this last text, Ἰππόστρατος Ἰπποδήμου, a Milesian. The father’s name ought to have given pause, as the Chian version now makes plain by offering Ἰπποδάμου. Names ending in -δάμος are of course legion: Φιλόδήμος “friend of the people,” Ἀρχέδημος “commander of the people,” etc. But who would be called Ἰππόδημος “horse of the people”?\textsuperscript{19} Petzl (p. 170) commented on and preferred the Chian copy’s Ἰπποδάμου, which contradicted the “Ionic” form that was written at Miletus and Smyrna. We can label that form as pseudo-Ionic, a hypercorrection founded on a false etymology, and so an interesting ancient error.

For the second element of Ἰππόδαμος is not δήμο-, “master”. This produced a number of names, most abundantly Δόμου, morphologically and lexically like Κρέον and Κρέων, all “master”. In the name Δημοδάμας/Δαμοδάμας “master of the people,” the two roots are unconfused.\textsuperscript{20} Similarly, Δεισίδημος is about as common. Both are somewhat more common than the approximate synonym Ἰππόλυτος “horse-breaker.”

\textsuperscript{14} IG XII.3 34.10. Prominent apices are reported on the letters, so late Hellenistic; II B.C. according to Hiller (IG). S. I. Charitonides, ArchDelt 16A (1960) 97–99, publishing a Telian list of early III B.C., is unpersuasive in assigning all these lists to that early date on prosopographical grounds.

\textsuperscript{15} Hiller, RE Suppl. 5 (1931) 754. I. Papachristodoulou, in V. Gabrielsen et al., Hellenistic Rhodes (Aarhus 1999) 38, cautiously judges the attribution of Telos to be indeterminable.

\textsuperscript{16} Kern, IG IX.2 506.2 (II B.C.). Hiller for whatever reason did not include the name in his index to IG IX.2, nor did F. Bechtel, Die historischen Personennamen ... (Halle 1917).

\textsuperscript{17} Professor Klaus Hallof kindly informs me that the Berlin squeeze is illegible here.


\textsuperscript{19} W. Otto, RE 8 (1913) 1921, tacitly corrected the courtier to “Hippomedos”, and C. Franco, Regno di Lisiimaco (Pisa 1993) 106, wrote “Hippodamos” without comment. In SEG 52, 675, a Ἰππόδημος(?) at Apollonia Pontica is rightly headlined “Hippodamus”.

\textsuperscript{20} Ionic Δημοδάμας e.g. at Miletus (FGrHist 428, Didyma nos. 479 ff.; L. Robert, BCH 108 [1984] 467-472 [= Documents d’Asie Mineure (Paris 1987) 455–460]) and Tenos (IG XII Suppl. 312); Doric Δαμοδάμας at Delphi (CID II 110.15) and Thera (IG XII.3 1299.8, 1525, Suppl. 320).
The mistaken spelling Ἱπποδήμου can hardly be an error (or a decision) that was made independently at both Smyrna and Miletus. And the Miletus copy has Ἱπποδήμου not only twice in the decree but also twice in the riders composed and added in Miletus. Ἱπποδήμου is what both cities found in the texts that they received from the League. Not so at Chios, with the correct and universal Ἱπποδάμου.

At the Ionian League’s meeting, someone had to write out copies of the decree to be given to each of the delegations. A copyist, perhaps an overly patriotic Ionian, evidently was misled by the ubiquity of names ending in -δῆμος and imagined Ἱπποδάμου to be Doric; he Ionized it to Ἱπποδήμου.21 Maybe he did not do that in some other copies, one of which went to the Chians – on this theory, one spelling or the other was his second thought, whether making the hypercorrection or regretting it. Or else (as seems more likely) a second copyist also was at work for the Ionian League, a less meddlesome fellow who respected Ἱπποδάμου in writing out the copy that was given to the Chians.

A contemporary parallel – or else a contradiction: in Eretria in the generation around 300 B.C., at least eight men (sorted out in LGPN I) have the name Δήμιππος rather than the proper Δάμιππος. They are found in more than one ward of the city, and so represent more than one family. The form seems to be a local affectation, not attested elsewhere. The verbal intent, if not the meaning, is clear in one case: a man named Ἱππόδαμος named his son Δήμιππος, who in turn named his son Ἱππόδαμος – they regarded the two names as echoes (IG XII.9.246.63, 72).22 Does Demippos represent a deliberate but misguided (and short-lived) Ionism? or did they think that both names meant “horse of the people”? Then again, in the same years an Eretrian Εὐδήμος named his son Εὐδήμιππος (249.i.91). Theocritus (2.77) knew the expected name Εὐδάμιππος, presumably “good at mastering horses” – but in a Doric setting. A final instance of seeming confusion in Ionian Eretria is Δημοφάνης (249.B.91). Both Fick and Bechtel23 were careful to say that we cannot always be sure what to do with -δαμ-.24

Iconium

The museum in Konya has a funerary monument from the region, preserving the bust of a woman and an inscription. McLean’s publication gave:24

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ἄρῃ} & \text{ ἱερεὺς} \\
\text{Α} & \text{ [. . . εὐχήν].}
\end{align*}
\]

A copy made by Hall has now been located and published by M. Metcalfe:25

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Αριστοβούλη} & \\
\text{α} & \text{ Απεχαίρε}.
\end{align*}
\]

Obviously the text was most difficult to read; and Metcalfe reports that a squeeze and photograph show nothing. It may be also that both copyists were on some details deceived by ligatures. Hall’s transcription visibly contains more Greek and is consistent with the female portrait; it was convincingly preferred by Metcalfe, who translated “Aristoboula for Ape/Apes, farewell”.

We do not however expect a Doric name in central Anatolia in Imperial times. With funerary χαίρε a dative would be a rarity, and Απ is not on its face a name in the dative. With so difficult a task of reading, and with contradictory copies, there is no profit in trying to decide whether to employ square brackets, angle brackets, dots, or the Cologne asterisks. Let them go: in the second line the mason either wrote or intended to write the ubiquitous ἁλιπε χαίρε. In the first line, then, the lady portrayed will be Αριστοβούλη[η].

---

21 Compare on Augustan Cos the hypercorrect and pseudo-Doric ἐποιησάμαν in the florid IG XII.4.352.7 (with Hallof’s note); the affectation -σάμαν seems otherwise confined to verse.
22 Another pair of Demippoi were grandfather and grandson, with a correct Ionic Euphemos in between (241.27, 245.253).
23 A. Fick, Die griechischen Personennamen (Göttingen 1894) 90; Bechtel, Personennamen 116.
Salamis in Cyprus

In 1855 Sakellariou published an inscription which he had copied “in old Salamis by the presumed ancient buildings of the city.” The text was printed thus:

\[ \Sigmaαλλα\]\[\]μινίων \( t\) \( t\) \( p\)όλει \( kαι \) \( t\) \( d\)ήμω
\[Πασικρά]τη\(s\) Έμπυ\(\)λου\) κα\(i\) \( ι\)\(s\)ο\(n\) Καρπ-\(ι\)\(o\)νος \[άγιο\]ρομοιο\(μ\)\(υ\)\(ν\)\(t\)\(e\)
\[στοι\(z\) \(παν\)τοί\(a\)ς \(κατε\(σ\)κεύα\(σ\)\(s\)\(a\)

The stone is lost; the date will be Hellenistic or early Imperial. In an early publication we cannot be confident about the implied absence of iota adscript. Moreover, the lines are of quite unequal lengths; this suggests that on the stone they were in fact centered. It is frequent in early editions of inscriptions that centering was ignored by the typesetter.

Two agoranomoi have overseen some construction and now dedicate the work to the city. In line 4, Sakellariou’s restoration has been rejected by the editors of Salamine XIII, who print only \[- - -\]τοίας. Certainly building or repairing “all sorts of stoas” is most unlikely as an expression and as an action. But I would urge that Sakellariou had the substance right: take the line as centered, and restore simply \[τ\(a\)ς \(σ\)τοιάς \(κατε\(σ\)κεύα\(σ\)\(s\)\(a\)

The spelling στοιά/στωιά with iota is often met in inscriptions, and was known to Aelius Herodian and later lexicographers, who compared προστώον and περιστώον. It is more common in Doric (e.g. IG XII.3 170.22 [Astypalaea], I.Kalchedon 12.25; SEG 9, 5.20 [Cyrene]); in Cretan, στοιά is normal. But the usage with iota was wide-spread: in Koine, at Miletus LSCG 123.1, Delos IG XI.2 229.A.10; and in Egypt, \(τ\(a\)ς \(γ\(o\)ν\(i\)ς \(t\)\(η\) \(στοι\(ά\)ς \(P.Oxy\) XX 2272.9, A.D. 169).

In Imperial times we sometimes find στοιά: in Phrygia, τήν \(ε\)\(ξ\)\(έ\)\(δρ\)\(o\)ν κα\(t\) τήν \(στο\(ι\)\(ά\)ν (MAMA IV 309, A.D. 136/7); in the Palmyrene dedication at Coptos (III A.D.), \(τ\(ο\) \(π\(r\)\(o\)\(s\)λ\(λ\)\(α\i\)\(o\)ν κα\(t\) \(τ\(a\)ς \(στοι\(α\)ς \(τ\(r\)\(e\i\)\(t\)\(i\)\)

As to the date, it may be relevant that the gymnasium in Salamis as rebuilt in Augustan times was flanked by stoas, as was its Flavian successor; whether its Hellenistic predecessor had had stoas is not known.

Kent J. Rigsby, Chicago
krisgby@duke.edu

---

26 A. A. Sakellariou, Ta Kypriaka 1 (Athens 1855) 171 [Salamine XIII no. 36]. In line 2, the editors of Salamine prefer \[Σ\(t\)\(o\)σικρά\]τ\(η\)\(ς\).

27 Salamine gives the date as first century B.C. on the grounds of “gravure et onomastique”.

28 In Roman Cyprus, a dedication of multiple stoas is recorded at Kition, \(τ\(a\)ς \(σ\)τοιάς κα\(t\) \(τ\(a\) \(ἐ\)\(ν \(α\)\(υ\)\(τ\)\(α\i\)\(i\)\(ς \(π\(ά\)\(ν\)\(t\)\(α\)

29 Cf. F. Bechtel, Die griechischen Dialekte II (Berlin 1923) 677 (iota “consonantisch”).

30 IG gives \(ἐ\)\(π\)\(k\)\(ο\)\(n\)\(ύ\)\(ο\)\(ν\)\(t\)\(ι\)\(n\)\(a\)\(v\)\(t\)\(a\)\(ς \(M.-C. Hellmann, Recherches sur le vocabulaire de l'architecture grecque (Paris 1992) 384, prints στοίάν.

31 I.Portes 103, as revised by J. Bingen, Pages d'épigraphie grecque II (Brussels 2005) 52–56 (reading στοιάς and correcting to στοίας).


33 V. Karageorgis, Salamis (New York 1969) 167–193, and \(Α\(ν\)\(α\)σκάπ\(π\)\(τ\)\(ο\)\(ν\)\(t\)\(a\)ς \(τ\(η\) \(Σ\a\)\(λ\a\)\(μ\a\)\(ι\a\)\(a\) (Athens 1999) 21–77.

34 Warm thanks to Georg Petzl for correction and advice.