

KENT J. RIGSBY

NOTES ON GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 185 (2013) 137–142

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

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:¹

ἀθάνατον μ(ν)άμ(α)ν ἀρετᾶς, Δαμόστρατε, λε[ίπεις]
 ἀρχαίαν ἔχθραν εἰς φιλίαν ἀγαγών.
 σὺν πατρίδα Σπάρταν καὶ Μεσ(σ)άνα(ν) ὁμαλί[σαι]
 πολλῶν εὐξαμένων, σοὶ τόδε νεῖμε Τύ[χη].²

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 II²* 380.22, ὁμαλισθῶσιν καὶ κατασκ[ε]υασθῶσιν ὡς βέλτιστα). 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”.³ The adjective is rare in the authors⁴ 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 ὁμ- is seen e.g. in the poetic ὁμήγουρις for πανήγουρις (e.g. *I.Cret.* I VIII 33.10) and once in ὁμοπολιτεία 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, εὐχετο γραῶν ... εὐχετο λιμόν). LSJ offer examples of a double accusative without εἶναι, but only with εὐχομαι meaning “boast”. But an epigram from Lesbos (*GVI* 309), though with one accusative, offers an expression even more elliptical than at Messene: τὴν κύναν Λεσβιακῆ βώλωι ὑπεθήκατο Βάλβος / εὐξάμενος κούφην τῆι κατὰ γῆς σκύ[λ]α[κι], “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):

Γναί[ον Πομπήϊον Γναίου]
 υἱὸν Μ[έγαν -----]-
 χήσαν[τα καὶ -----]-

¹ P. Thémélis, *PAAH* 1997, 108–112 [*SEG* 47, 390], and in R. Frei-Stolba and K. Gex, *Recherches récentes sur le monde hellénistique* (Bern 2001) 201–203, both with photographs.

² 1 MAMNAP, 3 ΜΕΣΑΝΑΟΜ 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 Δαμόστρατ’, ἔλε[ιπες], 4 τὸδ’ ἔνειμε.

³ For examples of “brother peoples” see *TAPA* 110 (1980) 242–248, *I.Ephesos* 2055, *I.Arykanda* 1; “sister cities”, Tert. *Pall.* 1.2 *soror civitas* (Utica to Carthage).

⁴ Especially if we discount Theodore of Studius, who was unaccountably fond of it.

σαντα, [ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ]
 εὐνοί[ας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτούς].
 vac.

Thus, Dittenberger took the monument to be a statue of Pompey, hence a date between the 60's and 48 B.C. As 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. The text could as well begin with [ὁ δῆμος ὁ - -] or with the name of a person, and end ἑαυτόν]. The find-spot of the stone is unreported. It may have come to the museum from farther afield than the territory of Thebes, so possibly the dedicator and the honorand were not Theban.

That the space in line 1 is right for restoring the name of Pompey the Great is no argument. The two participles make it necessary to abandon the general. Rather, this monument was for a Greek, a local man named *M*– (*M*[ένωνα vel sim.) who had gained Roman citizenship through a Roman *Gnaius* –. His name would be of the pattern T. Φλάουιον Φιλείνου υἱὸν Μόνδωνα (Roesch, *I.Thespieae* 378: I A.D.). There will then be several possibilities for his offices, e.g. Boeotarch for the first.⁵ Perhaps the most likely restoration would be γυμνασιαρ[χ]ήσαν[τα καὶ ἀγορανομί]σαντα (cf. *I.Thespieae* 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.

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.⁶ The latter gave a text and tentative translation:

πέδοις Νεῖλο(υ) χ[ά]ροις τ' ἔφυες·
 κουρῆς δ' αὐτε φίλασ' ἔσθλον
 νόον οὐνεκα πάσας νείκης
 ἐνγαμέτας σώφροσιν ἀνφὶ 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.

πέδοις, ἔφυες, and νείκης ἐνγαμέτας are hardly Greek, and φίλασ' cannot easily yield a verb. Tziaphalias had offered a credible text: in 1, [Ἄιδος ἐν δα]πέδοις; in 2, the adjective φίλας; in 3–4, the verb νείκησεν (approved by Pleket in *SEG*). A. and M. Kontogiannis (in *SEG*) saw that line 1 has Νεῖλο[ρύ]τοις.

A new sentence must begin with οὐνεκα: “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 unexampld ἔφυες. The photograph shows traces including the lower parts of three hastas, and seems to allow at the end CE as well as EC, the ending of an aorist verb. Possibly the girl's father “engendered” (ἔφυσε) her noble mind. But ἔφυσε, like ἔφυες, would not scan; and, more compelling, δ' αὐτε implies that νόον is the second object of the verb in this sentence. Perhaps then unaugmented γέμισε. Virtues/vices or emotions might “fill” a person or a mind.⁷ On that theory, some

⁵ On Boeotarchs in Roman Boeotia see D. Knoepfler, L'exercice de la magistrature fédéral béotienne, in Q. Heller and A.-V. Pont, *Patrie d'origine et patries électives* (Bordeaux 2012) 223–247.

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: Νεῖλον - - -) [*SEG* 43, 301 with corrections].

⁷ Philo *Spec.Leg.* 4.129 has persons “filled with piety”, γεμισθέντας εὐσεβείας; 2.46 with καλοκάγαθίας; *Migr.Abr.* 36 πικρίας γέμοντα νοῦν; *Somm.* 2.296 ψυχῆ ... γέμουσα ἀλαζονείας; 3 Macc. 5.47 ὀργῆ βαρεῖα γεμίσας δυσσεβῆ φρένα; Ach. Tat. 6.19.5 ὁ θυμὸς καχλάζων γεμισθῆ (cf. 5.1.1, her beauty filled my eyes with pleasure, μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐγέμισεν ἡδονῆς); John Chrysos. *Hom.* 19 (PG 49.190) τὰ νοήματα αὐτοῖς πολλῆς γέμῃ σοφίας. Persons filled (γέμω) with χαρίτων at

sentiment or virtue (e.g. εὐσεβίη, σοφίη) filled her parent(s) (e.g. τούς 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,⁸ 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. *IGUrbRom* 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: ἁ δὲ πολυθρήνητος ἐπέφθιτο ματέρι κούρα / Παμφίλη, daughter of Ἐρμιόνη.⁹ In the Pharsalus poem, the well-attested personal name Φίλα would be unproblematic: “the noble mind of their child Phila”.

Thus, in metrical lines:

[δα]πέδοις Νείλο[ρύ]τοις γέμισε(?),
κούρης δ' αὐτε Φίλας ἐσθλὸν νόον· οὐνεκα πάσας
νείκησεν γαμετὰς σώφροσιν ἀνφὶ 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:¹⁰

Αὐρ. Φίλα παραγγέλλι παν-
τὶ ᾠδήποτε μετὰ τὸ αὐτὴν
τεθῆνε ἰς τὴν ληνὸν
μηδὲ ἀνύξε ἕτερον
τῶ ἐῶν· εἰ δὲ μή, ο- - -

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,¹¹ a land proverbial for piety and for wisdom.¹²

Rhodes

A man on Rhodes had a vision of a chthonic spirit, to whom he then dedicated an altar.¹³ The stone, in the Rhodes museum without provenance, was read:

Ἱέρων
Δεισιθέμιος
κατὰ τὸ ὄραμ[α]
Ἱερῶι.

Anth.Gr. 5.227.6, 9.666.2, *IGUrbRom* III 1294.1. Cf. *Anth.Gr.* 1.10.25 σεῖο μενοινην εὐσεβίης πλήθουσας. The concept is old, e.g. *Il.* 17.498 σθένεος πλήτο φρένας ἀμφὶ μελαίνας.

⁸ E.g. φίλε κούρε Callim. fr. 27, *Anth.Gr.* 12.101.5, 16.344.1. παῖδα/τέκνον φίλον/ην could be read in every graveyard.

⁹ *I.Cilicie* 41.5–6 [SEG 37, 1459; R. Merkelbach – J. Stauber, *Steinepigramme* 4 [2002], 240, no. 20 / 01 / 03] from Seleucia in Pieria, I B.C.

¹⁰ W. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece* I (London 1835) 454 and pl. II no. 14 [IG IX.2 254; *I.Thess.* I 106].

¹¹ Like Myrto, buried in Demetrias, Νειλογενής (*GVI* 1390). Cf. *IGUR* III 1321.2, προλιπὼν Ῥώμης δάπεδον Νείλου πόλιν ἐλθὼν (III A.D.); *Anth.Gr.* 7.477 (Tymnes no. 2 in Gow/Page, *HE*), from the Nile to lie in Cretan Eleutherna.

¹² One doctor’s wisdom stemmed from Νειλόρυτος Alexandria: *GVI* 766.

¹³ P. M. Frazer, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* (Oxford 1977) 40, 79, and fig. 110(a) [SEG 27, 460], late Hellenistic or early Imperial.

The father's name *Deisithemis*, apparently unparalleled, is disquieting. The similar formation Δεισίθεος, "god-fearing" is attested and unproblematic; θεουδείς 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]λεισιθέμιος. The name *Kleisithemis* is found of several men at Lindos and one on Telos under Rhodian rule,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.¹⁵

Much the same unease is raised by the name *Deisippos*, reported once: Λέοντος Δεισιππέιοι at Larisa in Thessaly.¹⁶ Would a Thessalian name his son "afraid of horses"? The stone was described by Kern as hard to read.¹⁷ One thinks instead of better-attested names, *Deinippos* or even *Ageisippos*, Δεινιππέιοι / Ἀγεισιππέιοι.

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.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 -δημος are of course legion: Φιλόδημος "friend of the people," Ἀρχέδημος "commander of the people," etc. But who would be called Ἰππόδημος "horse of the people"?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 δημ- but the root δᾶμ-, "master". This produced a number of names, most abundantly Δάμων, morphologically and lexically like Κρέων and Κράτων, all "master". In the name Δημοδάμας/Δαμοδάμας "master of the people," the two roots are unconfused.²⁰ Similarly, Λεωδαμ- and its variants are common enough, while a nonsensical Λεωδημ- is unattested. The name Ἰππόδαμος "horse-master" is found throughout the Greek world, most famously, as Petzl observed, the Milesian city-planner. The word was already canonized in Homer as a heroic epithet; it is in fact the last word of the *Iliad*, Ἐκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο. Its inverse, Δάμιππος, is about as common. Both are somewhat more common than the approximate synonym Ἰππόλυτος "horse-breaker."

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.

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.

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).

¹⁷ Professor Klaus Hallof kindly informs me that the Berlin squeeze is illegible here.

¹⁸ Smyrna: G. Petzl, *I. Smyrna* 577. Miletus: Hiller, *Syll.*³ 368; A. Rehm, *Milet* I 114, no. 10, with P. Herrmann, *Milet* VI 1 (1997), p. 157f., no. 10. Chios: G. Forrest, *Horos* 3 (1985) 95–96 [*SEG* 35, 926], as revised by G. Petzl, in T. Takaoğlu (ed.), *Anadolu Arkeolojisiine Katkılar* (Istanbul 2006) 166–172 [*SEG* 56, 999].

¹⁹ W. Otto, *RE* 8 (1913) 1921, tacitly corrected the courtier to "Hippomedos", and C. Franco, *Regno di Lisimaco* (Pisa 1993) 106, wrote "Hippodamos" without comment. In *SEG* 52, 675, a Ἰππόδ[η]μος(?) at Apollonia Pontica is rightly headlined "Hippodamus".

²⁰ Ionic Δημοδάμας e.g. at Miletus (*FG+Hist* 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 Ἴπποδήμου can hardly be an error (or a decision) that was made independently at both Smyrna and Miletus. And the Miletus copy has Ἴπποδήμου not only twice in the decree but also twice in the riders composed and added in Miletus. Ἴπποδήμου is what both cities found in the texts that they received from the League. Not so at Chios, with the correct and universal Ἴπποδάμου.

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 -δημος and imagined Ἴπποδάμου to be Doric; he Ionized it to Ἴπποδήμου.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 Ἴπποδάμου 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 Ἴππόδαμος named his son Δήμιππος, who in turn named his son Ἴππόδαμος – 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.ii.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 Εὐδάμου, if this is rightly read (246.B.91). Both Fick and Bechtel²³ were careful to say that we cannot always be sure what to do with -δαμ-.

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

Ἄρη ἱερεὺς
ΑΗ[. . . εὐχ]ήν.

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

Ἀριστοβούλ-
α Απε χάρε.

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 χάρε a dative would be a rarity, and Απε 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 ἄλυπε χάρε. In the first line, then, the lady portrayed will be Ἀριστοβούλ[η].

²¹ Compare on Augustan Cos the hypercorrect and pseudo-Doric ἐποησιόμαον in the florid *IG XII.4 352.7* (with Hallof's note); the affectation -σάμαον 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*² (Göttingen 1894) 90; Bechtel, *Personennamen* 116.

²⁴ B. H. McLean, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Konya Archaeological Museum* (London 2002) no. 36.

²⁵ M. Metcalfe, *AnatStud* 59 (2009) 78.

Salamis in Cyprus

In 1855 Sakellariou published an inscription which he had copied “in old Salamis by the presumed ancient buildings of the city”.²⁶ The text was printed thus:

[Σαλα]μινίων τῆ πόλει καὶ τῷ δήμῳ
 [Πασικρά]της Ἐμπύ[λου] καὶ Ἰάσων Καρπ-
 ίωνος [ἀγ]ορανομοῦντες
 [στοῶς παν]τοίας κατεσκεύασαν.

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.²⁷ 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 [τὰς σ]τοιάς κατεσκεύασαν.²⁸

The spelling στωιά/στωιά with iota is often met in inscriptions, and was known to Aelius Herodian and later lexicographers, who compared προστῶον and περιστῶον. 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, στωιά is normal.²⁹ But the usage with iota was wide-spread: in Koine, at Miletus *LSCG* 123.1, Delos *IG* XI.2 229.A.10;³⁰ and in Egypt, τὰς γωνίας τῆς στωιάς (*P.Oxy.* XX 2272.9, A.D. 169).

In Imperial times we sometimes find στωιά: in Phrygia, τὴν ἐξέδραν καὶ τὴν στωῖαν (*MAMA* IV 309, A.D. 136/7); in the Palmyrene dedication at Coptos (III A.D.), τὸ προπύλαιον καὶ τὰς στωῖας τρεῖς.³¹ In these cases, perhaps we should not correct by deletion (to στωῖα) but rather understand that στωιά is meant, the grapheme υ for ι reflecting their common pronunciation now, as in the good Latin name Αἴλυος,³² pronounced *elyos*.

As to the date, it may be relevant that the gymnasium in Salamis³³ as rebuilt in Augustan times was flanked by stoas, as was its Flavian successor; whether its Hellenistic predecessor had had stoas is not known.³⁴

Kent J. Rigsby, Chicago
 krisgby@duke.edu

²⁶ A. A. Sakellariou, *Ta Kypriaka* I (Athens 1855) 171 [*Salamine* XIII no. 36]. In line 2, the editors of *Salamine* prefer [Στασικρά]της.

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, τὰς στοῶς καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς πάντα: T. Oziol, *I.Kition (Kition-Bamboula* V) no. 2009 (Augustan).

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

³⁰ *IG* gives ἐπικονιάσαντι τὴν στωι[άν?]; M.-C. Hellmann, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire de l’architecture grecque* (Paris 1992) 384, prints στω[άν].

³¹ *I.Portes* 103, as revised by J. Bingen, *Pages d’épigraphie grecque* II (Brussels 2005) 52–56 (reading στωῶς and correcting to στωῖας).

³² E.g. *TAM* V 1772, *MAMA* VII 78. Earlier examples of ι/υ in Athens: L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* I (Berlin 1980) 262.

³³ V. Karageorgis, *Salamis* (New York 1969) 167–193, and *Ανασκάπτοντας τη Σαλαμίνα* (Athens 1999) 21–77.

³⁴ Warm thanks to Georg Petzl for correction and advice.