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](#)

Perta of Lycaonia

W. M. Ramsay

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 01 / February 1909, pp 7 - 9
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00002407, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00002407

How to cite this article:

W. M. Ramsay (1909). Perta of Lycaonia. The Classical Review, 23, pp 7-9 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00002407

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

PERTA OF LYCAONIA.

INSCRIPTION found in 1907 at Kotchash, a small village on the north side of Boz Dag, about 10 hrs. North of Konia. Also copied in 1908 by Sir W. M. Ramsay. A round pillar.

ΘΕΙΑΠΡΟΝΟΜΙΑΦΙΛΟ Μ^ς
ΠΑΡΑΤΩΝΘΕΟΦΥΛΑΚΤΩΝ
ΗΜΩΝΔΕΣΠΟΤΑΙΑΚΑΛΛΙ-
ΝΙΚΗΤΕΝΔΟΣ^ςΑΠΟΝΠΑΤ
ΙΟΙCΤΗΝΠΕΡΤΕΩΝΟΙΚΩCΙ
ΠΟΛΙΝ

+

θεία προνομία φιλο[τε]μ(ηθέντα)
παρὰ τῶν θεοφυλάκτων
ἡμῶν δεσπ(οτῶνδύο) διὰ Καλλι-
νίκου τοῦ ἐνδόξ(οτάτου) ἀπὸ ὑπάτ[ων]
τ[ο]ῖς τὴν Περτέων οἰκοῦσι
πόλιν¹

The date of this inscription remains uncertain, unless Callinicus can be identified. As Callinicus had been consul, the date cannot be later than the middle of the sixth century. θεοφύλακτος δεσπότης is applied to Emperors from about 610 A.D. onwards for several centuries (according to the Index of C.I.G.). The form of letters affords no safe criterion of date in late Roman and Byzantine times.

The nature of the monument is also uncertain. It has most analogy to a boundary stone. It might be a milestone if there were any distance stated on it; but in Byzantine time milestones were rare. It perhaps marked an important point on the road without recording the distance from a *caput viae*.

The important fact about the inscription is that it furnishes evidence to place the city of Perta (a bishopric in Christian time) in this neighbourhood. Sir W. M. Ramsay has placed Psibêla or Pegella (the latter form is used in the Peutinger Table, the former in Byzantine documents) at Suwarek, and pointed out that an important Roman road marked by many milestones ran from

Laodiceia of Lycaonia through Pegella, passing beside this inscription, to Savatra, Cana, Hyde, the Cilician Gates and Syria. Now on a road in the Table we find the stations

Pegella xx Congussa xv Petra xx Ubinnaca.

It is, therefore, now established conclusively that Petra of the Table is an error for Perta, and that Perta was situated on this Roman road between Pegella and Savatra. The name Savatra is misplaced in the Table; but its situation on the road has been assured by inscriptions. So also has the site of Cana; and Sir W. M. Ramsay has conjectured that Ubinnaca is an error for Uden Cana. See his paper on Lycaonia in the *Oesterreich. Jahreshfte*, vii. 57-132 (*Beiblatt*), where also it is assumed that, as is now certain, Petra of the Table is meant for Perta. The numbers in the Table are not reconcilable with the actual distances.

T. CALLANDER.

Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.

Professor T. Callander communicated the above inscription to me in 1907, and in the summer of 1908 I revisited the district in order to fix the exact site of Perta. Kotchash, where the stone was found, is not the site of an ancient city, but only of a village; and I came to the conclusion that the modern village Geimir, about five miles south-east, is the site of Perta. The ruins there are extensive, and mark an ancient city. In 1907 and in 1908 neither Professor Callander nor I found any inscription there, only Christian carved stones uninscribed. But in 1905 I copied several inscriptions on the site, and one of these proved that it was an important place in Roman times. This was a fragment of the architrave of a temple or other public building, with part of the dedication to an Emperor of the second century in very large fine letters:

ΑΔΡΙΑΝΟΥΑΙ
ΠΡΟΒΟΥ

The letters of the second line were mutilated, and only the upper part remained, but all are certain except B (which might be read P).

¹Confirmed by R. almost exactly, except in l. 5, where he read IOIC, while I read KOIC.

The restoration is uncertain. One might conjecture:

[ὕπὲρ τῆς Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Π. Αἰλίου Τραι-
ανοῦ] Ἀδριανοῦ αἰ[ωνίου διαμονῆς
. . . . οἱ] πρόβου[λοι ὁρ κατὰ τὸ] προβοῦ[λεμμα.

It is not probable that the correct order of the imperial names was violated by placing Αἰ[λίου] after Ἀδριανός in the title either of Hadrian or of Pius.

I know of nothing analogous to the last words. The terms πρόβουλοι and προβοῦ-
λεμμα are almost confined to Athens, except that Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses them to render the Latin words *consules* and *senatus consultum*, and Plutarch uses the former in that sense. It is therefore possible that κατὰ προβοῦλεμμα was used at Perta to translate the Latin *senatus consulto*. But in a Galatian city, in an imperial province, one does not expect to find any reference to a decree of the Roman Senate.

On a subsequent journey I visited Obruk in order to see the famous circular lake in a deep hole. As two archaeologists have been at Obruk in modern times, both interested in epigraphy, and neither found any inscriptions, I had no expectation of discovering any. But to my astonishment the fine old Seljuk Khan and the cemetery are both full of inscriptions, including six Roman milestones, and a second copy of Professor Callander's inscription. The latter differs only in one or two slight details; notably, it gives the word φιλοτιμηθέντα in full.

The sense in earlier Greek and Graeco-Roman usage would be that the stones on which the inscriptions are engraved were φιλοτιμηθέντα διὰ Καλλινίκου, 'set up in the career of public service by Callinicus.'¹ He modestly attributes the action to the Emperors, and mentions himself only as their agent. This makes one at first think of boundary stones; but Obruk seems to be the site of an independent city, and not a mere village dependent on Perta. Now if this stone marked a boundary, it would be necessary to take Obruk as a village near the frontier of the land of the city Perta. It seems, on the whole, most probable that Professor

Callander's suggestion is right, and that the stones mark the roads at important points.

But I prefer to take the inscription as comparatively late (perhaps late fifth or early sixth century); and to see here the common sense in Byzantine times of φιλοτιμέομαι, 'give as a compliment' (construction, two accusatives, or accusative and dative). The aorist ἐφιλοτιμήθην is usually active; but Stephanus quotes Georg. Mon. 809: φιλοτιμηθεῖς παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως νομίσματα ἑκατον, 'having been granted by the king 100 nummi.' The passive use also occurs in Theophilus Antecessor: *prooem*.¹

νίκαις ἄνωθεν φιλοτιμηθείσais²
'victories granted from heaven.'

Callinicus, as Professor Seeck and Professor Dessau inform me, is unknown. He was evidently governor of a Province, who placed these stones by orders of two emperors. The only Provinces which can be thought of are Pisidia if the inscription be older than 372, and Lycaonia if it be later. Perta was certainly in Lycaonia from the institution of that Province about 371-2. The sense of φιλοτιμηθέντα (if I rightly take it according to Byzantine usage) and the style of letters (which is not dissimilar to the inscription of Epinicus³ in the end of the fifth century, though less ornate), point to a later date than 372. Now Callinicus was a consular, and Lycaonia was governed by a simple *praeses* in *Notitia. Dignit. Or.* in the beginning of the fifth century, but by a consular in the list of Hierocles, about A.D. 530. The period therefore, as seems fairly certain, was not very far removed from A.D. 500.

One of the Roman milestones at Obruk is inscribed VII, probably the distance from Perta (if we suppose that the stone has been brought to the cemetery from a point on the road about a mile towards that city). Another is marked ΚΔ, which is rather difficult to explain. The only important point which

² In the edition which lies before me (*apud Guil. Laetmarium*: 1587) the text printed is φιλοτιμηθείσais, but the correction seems necessary, and is assumed in the Latin translation.

³ Published by Mommsen in *Hermes* xxxii p. 660, and included in part in his *Gesammelte Schriften* by O. Hirschfeld, *Histor.* i p. 560.

¹ If we can assume that ἐφιλοτιμήθην could be used in a passive sense in that period.

is near xxiv miles from Obruk is Suwarek-Psibêla; and the road from the one town to the other does not form a part of any main route. We must suppose that at Obruk the town put up milestones indicating the distance from all the cities around. On the other milestones the numbers are indecipherable.

As to the name of the city at Obruk, that is a matter of complete uncertainty. It stands near, but not actually on, the direct road from Iconium to Archelais. Possibly

it may be Congoustos, understanding that the name has been slightly misplaced on the Table, or rather that the enumerator of the stations, instead of going along the direct road Pegella-Perta, went a circuit through Obruk; but the numbers would have to be corrected in that case to

Pegella xxv Congustos ix Perta.

W. M. RAMSAY.

Aberdeen.

ON VIRGIL, *ECLOGUES*, IX. 17.

Heu, cadit in quemquam tantum scelus?

EURIPIDES in his plays seems to have compensated for his many modernisms by a plentiful use of Homeric forms. In a like spirit Virgil seems to have sprinkled the artificial language which he puts into his shepherds' mouths with uses which may be called either colloquial or archaic, since the one is in most languages often the other. We know that the town wits laughed at one instance of this habit.

'Dic mihi, Damoeta: "cuium pecus" ane Latinum?'

In iii. 102, Donatus seems to have taken *his* as a nominative, a use extinct in polite Latin, but doubtless still common on rustic lips. Conington, even with *cuium* in the same Eclogue, accounted this interpretation 'a very hazardous hypothesis,' and Mr. Page regards the archaism as too startling to be true; but neither authority seems to have taken cognizance of the indirect support which Donatus gets from other passages in the *Eclogues*. Nor is it easy to make good sense of the line on any other supposition, except indeed the desperate remedy of reading *hi* for *his*. It may be observed that no interpretation gives a good sense to *certe*, and for *his certe* we should perhaps read *hisce autem*. The change is in any case very small, and perhaps the less that, as Pompeii shows, there were scripts in which it was not easy to distinguish *a* and *r*. Of course *hisce* is nominative. To return to our colloquialisms. We know the free way in which the comedians interchange

do and *facio*. Thus *me dubiam dant* means 'make me doubtful,' and *huic ego die nomen Trinummo feci* means 'I have given to-day the name of Half-a-Crown.' In i. 6, *nobis haec otia fecit* seems to mean 'has given us this ease,' and in i. 18 the use of *da nobis* as 'tell us' is probably a colloquialism which descends from Plautine days. In ii. 14 the use of *satius* as 'better,' though not unknown to classical prose, belongs in the main to the spoken tongue. With this we may class *qui* in a sense akin to *qualis*, ii. 19; *fero* in the sense of carry away, v. 34 and ix. 51; and perhaps *poteras* in i. 79, and *hodie* in iii. 49. In the last even Conington finds 'a sort of comic pleonasm' despite its use in *Aen.* ii. 670. More decisive is the interrogative *nam* in ix. 39, with which we may place *reponas*, a subjunctive in a direct command, iii. 54. The use of *mitto* in the sense of 'make a present,' iii. 71 and ix. 6, misled Conington, who says on the latter passage '*mittimus* is used seemingly because Moeris, though carrying the kids himself, speaks for his master, who is the sender of the present.' No doubt Moeris speaks as servants usually do, and says 'we are making him a present,' meaning that the present is made by his master, as in the former passage Menalcas carried the apples himself to his Amyntas. This sense of *mitto* is found in Terence, e.g. *Phor.* 50, *puer causa erit mittundi*, and reappears in silver Latin, e.g. *Juv.* iii. 45, *quae mittit*. In Terence the slave would probably