The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes on Some Inscriptions from Asia Minor

Marcus N. Tod

The Classical Review / Volume 29 / Issue 01 / February 2015, pp 1 - 4
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00047685, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00047685

How to cite this article:

Marcus N. Tod (1915). Notes on Some Inscriptions from Asia Minor. The Classical Review, 29, pp 1-4 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00047685

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

NOTES ON SOME INSCRIPTIONS FROM ASIA MINOR.

I.—Πατρομύστης.

THE latest fascicule of the invaluable collection of *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes* includes, together with a number of other texts from Smyrna, one (*I.G.R.* iv. 1393) which was published by Spon and by Muratori, and afterwards by Boeckh (*C.I.G.* 3173). It is a dedication to the Emperor Titus and his brother Domitian, attributed by Cagnat 'anno 80 post C.n.' The date can, however, be determined somewhat more exactly, since Titus is described as *δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ θ'* (*trib. pot. ix.*), and his ninth year of *tribunicia potestas* expired on June 30, 80 A.D. If, further, we suppose that Titus and Domitian were actually holding their eighth and seventh consulships respectively when the inscription was engraved, we must attribute it to one of the first four months of the year, since they were succeeded as consuls by L. Aelius Plautius Lamia Aelianus and C. Marius Marcellus Octavius Publius Cluvius Rufus certainly by June 13 (*C.I.L.* iii. p. 854) and probably on May 1.¹ After recording the names of the hereditary priest, the stephanephoros, the agonothetes, the xystarches, and the *διοικῶν*, the inscription proceeds (*a. l.* 14 ff.):

οἱ πε||πληρωκότες τὰ ἰσηλύσια | Σουλ-
πίκιος Φῆρμος, | Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ἀρτεμᾶ?

πατρομύστης, | Ἀπολλώνιος Εὐδήμο[υ] ?
πατρομύστης, | Τρόφιμος Ἀσκληπιάδου, ||
Τύραννος Παπίου τοῦ Μενάνδρου.

The inscription relates to the Guild, known to us from a number of epigraphical records, of which the full title seems to have been ἡ ἱερὰ σύνοδος τῶν περὶ τὸν Βρεῖσέα Διόνυσον τεχνειτῶν καὶ μυστῶν (*C.I.G.* 3190); of the nature of the god and the position of his sanctuary I need not speak, since the question has been recently discussed by Mrs. Hasluck (*B.S.A.* xix. 89 ff.). Several points, however, in the lines just quoted call for comment. In ll. 17, 18 Cagnat follows Boeckh in altering the Ἀρτεμᾶς and Εὐδήμος of the stone into Ἀρτεμᾶ and Εὐδήμο[υ] respectively, regarding them as patronymics. Now it is true that patronymics occur in *a* ll. 19, 20 and perhaps in *b* l. 5 of this inscription; but it is equally true that they are absent in seven cases and their presence is thus exceptional rather than normal. Moreover, the primary rule of epigraphy is not to assume that the engraver has erred save when forced to do so, and here there is no such necessity; for the possession of two names by the same individual is a common phenomenon in the Imperial period,² and though they are frequently united by ὁ καί, ὁ καλούμενος or some other phrase, this is by no means invariably

¹ Weynand *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa *R.E.* vi. 2719; Liebenam, *Fastī Consulares*, 16.

NO. CCXLVII. VOL. XXIX.

² See, *e.g.*, M. Lambertz in *Glotta*, 1913, 99 ff.

so. The inscriptions of Aphrodisias, for example, supply abundant evidence¹ as well as those of Pergamum,² while a further proof, if one be needed, of the same fact is furnished by the very inscription under discussion, where the name of the xystarches is given in *b* l. 7 as Διονύσιος Κικίνος νεώτερος).

The elaborate explanation of the phrase οἱ πεπληρωκότες τὰ (εἰ)σηλύσια given by Boeckh need not be repeated or discussed: εἰσηλύσιον is the regular term used in Imperial times for the entrance-fee charged by a society or guild, such as the Attic Iobacchi (*S.I.G.* 737), and the Pergamene ὑμνωδοί (*I.G.R.* iv. 353, *d* 13) and πρεσβύτεροι (*Ath. Mitt.* xxxii. 294, No. 18). The inscription, then, serves to record the fact that the five dedicators had duly paid their admission-fees. The first part of Cagnat's note, 'qui pecuniam debitam contulerunt cum in collegium admissi sunt, aut debitam ab aliis sua expleverunt,' is justified; for the second, however, there is no ground save an interpretation of the term πατρομύστης, according to which the patromystae are the leading members of the guild and therefore cannot have entered its membership quite recently.

Following Boeckh, Cagnat translates the term, which occurs elsewhere only in *C.I.G.* 3195, by 'mysta princeps, pater mystarum,' making it an honorary title.³ But it may be regarded as certain that the word, with which the cognate title πατρογέρων may be compared, denotes a hereditary member of the guild, one whose father is, or has been, a member. It was a common practice among the Greek societies to recruit their members as far as possible from the sons of those already admitted, and frequently these were charged a lower entrance-fee or sometimes none at all: hence arises the importance of noting in a list such as the present those who enjoyed this privilege.⁴

One question remains, which the editors have not discussed. What is the relation of the Σουλπίκιος Φίρμος, whose name occurs first among the newly-admitted members of the guild, to the Λ. Σουλπίκιος Φίρμος who is regarded as its financial manager (διοικητής)?⁵ Presumably not that of father and son, or the son would also be described as πατρομύστης. I am inclined to think that both names refer to the same person. The guild, it may be, required a manager and, having no one suitable among its existing members, it elected someone to hold the office in question; thus Firmus would stand last among the officials and first (taking precedence even of the two patromystae) on the list of new members. Another solution is to my mind more probable: in inscription *b* the list of officers comprises, in addition to the eponymous stephanephoros of the state, only the agonothetes and the xystarches; possibly therefore the phrase διοικούντος Λ. Σουλπικίου Φίρμου does not point to the tenure of a regular office but to the responsibility undertaken by Firmus, as first on the list of newly enrolled members, for the erection of this monument. True, the words commonly used in this connection are ἐπιμελούμαι, ἐπιμελητέω, προνοοῦμαι, etc., or simply διὰ with the genitive,⁶ but the use of διοικέω in this sense does not appear to me impossible.

II.—Πρεσβύτερος.

In the inscription already discussed two names (*b* ll. 6, 7) are qualified by the addition of νεώτερος, equivalent to our 'junior.' This involves the existence of a correlative term for 'senior,' which can hardly be any other than πρεσβύτερος. In Athens the use of these terms in the Imperial period is very common,⁷ in Laconia νεώτερος is used in this way (*I. G.* v. 1. 40, 41, [43], 69) and possibly also πρεσβύτερος,⁸ in

¹ *C.I.G.* 2748 Εὔμαχος Διογένης, 2768 τὸν δαῖνα Ζηνᾶν, 2772 Μύωνα Μένανδρον, 2842 Φιλόξενος Πάνθηρ, etc.

² *I.G.R.* iv. 374, 384, 420, 497, etc.

³ Cf. such titles as πατὴρ πόλεως, υἱὸς πόλεως, etc.

⁴ For the whole subject see F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, 298 ff.

⁵ F. Poland, *op. cit.* 378.

⁶ Larfeld, *Griech. Epigraphik*², 446 f.

⁷ *I.G.* iii. 1017, 1020, 1023, 1029, 1031-2, 1306, etc.

⁸ In *I.G.* v. 1. 1280, however, πρεσβυτέρα may represent the feminine form of the honorary title πρέσβυς τοῦ ἔθνους found in the same inscription.

Thessaly ὁ πρεσβύτερος and ὁ νεώτερος seem usual, though the article is sometimes omitted,¹ while in the west πρεσβύτερος and νεώτερος occur side by side in a Neapolitan text (*I.G.* xiv. 717, cf. 758), and the former is found also at Rome (1084) and at St. Gilles-sur-Rhône (2444). Examples from Asia Minor are rare, partly perhaps because the use of the term πρεσβύτερος in connection with the gymnasia and with many of the guilds and societies of the Graeco-Roman world,² and above all in the terminology of the Christian Church, made it less suitable for the purpose of distinguishing a father from his son who bore the same name. Yet the Attic usage was not unknown in the east. Besides the example from Smyrna already quoted we meet with a Π. Αἰ[λίος] Ἀπο[λλώνιος] νε(ώτερος) at Magnesia ad Sipylum (*I.G.R.* iv. 1342) and at Artanada (*Dulgerler*) in Cilicia with Παππᾶς Ὁὺς πρεσβύτερος,³ probably not a Christian presbyter, while at Adada (*Kara Baulo*) in Pisidia two inscriptions⁴ refer to a Βιάνωρ Ἀντιόχου πρεσβύτερος, whose pagan beliefs are attested by his tenure of the office of ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν. This gives us, I think, a key to the difficulty presented by a memorial inscription of Antioch in Pisidia (*J.R.S.* ii. 97, No. 26) set up by a certain [Αἰλίος] Κασ[σι]ανὸς [πρε]σβ(ύτερος). The editor, Professor W. M. Calder, concludes that the inscription is Christian and adds, 'but the open use of πρεσβύτερος on an epitaph in a centre of persecution like Antioch would be very unlikely before A.D. 323, and the inscription has the appearance of being earlier than this date.' If we give to πρεσβ(ύτερος) the meaning 'senior,' the difficulty disappears, and the necessity is removed of dating the inscription in the fourth century of our era, from which Professor Calder rightly recoils.⁵

III.—'Ἐπιτυχάνων.

Occasionally a difficulty is caused in the interpretation of inscriptions by the fact that many personal names are identical in form with common nouns, adjectives, or participles. Two examples, both involving the same mistake, have recently come to my notice in inscriptions from Asia Minor. In the *Revue Épigraphique* ii. 38 M. A. J. Reinach publishes a dedication found near *Kizil-Keui* in the Troad, which runs—

Ἀπόλλωνι Σμινθεῖ Φλάουιοι Φιλούμενος
καὶ Ἀγαθόπουλος ὁ καὶ Βούρδων ἐκ
διαθήκης Τ. Φλαοῦιου ἐπιτυχάνοντος.

The dedicator set up this acknowledgment, the editor tells us in his paraphrase, 'après un succès qu'il attribuait sans doute au dieu.' That ἐπιτυχάνω can bear the meaning 'I am successful' is beyond doubt: it is used in this sense, for example, in the phrase δ καὶ ἐπέτυχον of *I.G.* v. i. 1146, l. 29, and in the participle ἐπιτυχόντα in *I.G.R.* iv. 791, 914, 1251.⁶ Further, a participle is frequently found in a votive inscription to denote the occasion or cause of the dedication, as in *I.G.* v. i. 1363 [Εὐ]νομία Διὶ τυχώσα. Yet I am convinced that we must read Ἐπιτυχάνοντος in the inscription under discussion, since (i.) a *cognomen* is wanted to complete the *praenomen* and *nomen* Τ. Φλαοῦιου, (ii.) 'après un succès' would be represented by ἐπιτυχόντος, not by ἐπιτυχάνοντος, (iii.) 'in the hour of success' (which ἐπιτυχάνοντος must denote) cannot be meant, since this is a monument erected after the dedicator's death in conformity with his testament, and (iv.) Ἐπιτυχάνων (which has a feminine form Ἐπιτυχάνουσα and variants Ἐπιτύγχανος and Ἐπιτυχανίων) is a common name throughout the Greek world in the Imperial period.

In a sepulchral inscription of Cyzicus (*I.G.R.* iv. 170), again, we need have no hesitation in restoring the proper name in place of the participle in the phrase ἐξέστω δὲ τῷ ἀπελευθέρῳ μου τεθῆναι Ἐπιτυχάνοντι ἰς τὰ ὑπὸ τὴν σορόν.

¹ *I.G.* ix. 2. 15, 19, 21, 29, 531, 1165, etc.

² F. Poland, *op. cit.*, Index, s.v.

³ J. R. S. Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition*, 89.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 403, 412.

⁵ Νεώτερος occurs also in Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 527, νέος is used in the same way *ibid.* 487. The restoration τοῦ νε[ώτερου] in *C.I.G.* 2706 is quite uncertain, while the restoration Λέον[τα τὸν νεώτερον] in *C.I.G.* 2720, even if correct, is irrelevant to the present question.

⁶ See also T. Sauciuc, *Andros*, 141, No. 9.

A further example of the same source of misunderstanding may be mentioned here, as it occurs in the same volume as the last. A Samian honorary inscription of about 40 A.D. (*I.G.R.* iv. 981) opens with the words—

Ἡγεμονέα Λεωνίδου τοῦ ἡγεμονέως Καλλισθένην [ἄνδρα καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν.

Ἡγεμονεύς is a well-attested by-form of ἡγεμών: Liddell and Scott give references to Oppian, Musaeus, and the Palatine Anthology, and we may add a Spartan epigram of the late second or early third century after Christ (*I.G.* v. 1. 540), which begins—

Τὸν κλυτὸν ἡγεμονῆα Χαρεΐσιον ἄνθετο
κούρα

Σπάρτας ἃ πρώτα, Πηνελόπεια νέα.

Yet in the Samian inscription Ἡγεμονέα and Ἡγεμονέως must be regarded as personal names, for (i.) the order of the words demands it, (ii.) ἡγεμονεύς is a purely poetical term, and (iii.) if it denoted a title or office it would be preceded by the definite article. We thus get in Ἡγεμονέα Καλλισθένην a further example of the possession of a double name which has been discussed above, while the insertion of the patronymics between the first and the second name is normal rather than exceptional.

IV.—Φιλόπατρις.

An error of the opposite kind has, I think, crept into one or two texts. An honorary inscription of Eumenia published in *C.I.G.* 3887 begins—

ὁ δῆμος Ἐπίγονον Μενεκράτους φιλόπατρην.

In Ramsay (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 377, No. 199) Φιλόπατρις becomes a second name of Epigonus, and this version is followed in *I.G.R.* iv. 741. I cannot but believe that we have here the honorary title φιλόπατρις, which is exceedingly common in the Imperial period, often in conjunction with similar titles such as φιλόκαισαρ, φιλορώμαιος, φιλοσέβαστος, etc., and if it be objected that on a coin of the Augustan age Epigonus Philopatris is named,¹ we must remember that coins

frequently bear the titles of those mentioned upon them, even where they are of a purely honorary character, such as υἱὸς πόλεως.²

I would go further and strike out Philopatris as a personal name from *C.I.G.* 4411, an honorary inscription of Iotapa in Cilicia: there too it seems to me that there is no warrant for regarding it as such and no obstacle in the way of treating it as a title.

V.—Imperial Titles.

The value of Imperial titles as determining the dates of inscriptions is illustrated by the dedication from Smyrna from which these notes started. Occasionally, however, it is overlooked, as, for example, in two inscriptions of Thyssanus in the Rhodian Peraea recently published by Messrs. M. and N. Chavias (Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ. 1911, 62 f., Nos. 52 γ, 54). The first of these, attributed by the editors to the years 193-211 A.D., is in honour of Julia Domna and Septimius Severus, and the titles (Βρεταννικὸν μέγιστον . . . δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ιη', αὐτοκράτορα τὸ ιβ', ὑπατον τὸ γ') borne by the latter prove that the inscription was engraved in 210 A.D., between the bestowal of the title Britannicus Maximus and December 10, when the Emperor entered his nineteenth term of *tribunicia potestas*.³

The second, which is in honour of Caracalla, entitles the Emperor Βρεταννικὸν μέγιστ[ον, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας] τὸ ιγ', αὐτοκράτορα τὸ β', ὑπ[ατον τὸ (ll. 3, 4). This inscription also, then, must be dated between the grant of the title Britannicus Maximus in 210 and December 10 of that year, when Caracalla began his fourteenth tenure of *tribunicia potestas*. Moreover since he held his third consulship in 208 and his fourth in 213, we are justified in restoring ὑπ[ατον τὸ γ'] in l. 4.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

² B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*², Index V.

³ Liebenam, *Fasti Consulares*, 109 f. By a slip Liebenam writes that Severus' trib. pot. xxiii = 10th Dec. 210—4th Feb. 211: for xxiii we must read xix.

¹ Babelon, *Invent. de la coll. Waddington*, No. 6027.