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THREE NOTES ON PTOLEMAIC INSCRIPTIONS*

1. A HEGEMON ON CYPRUS

In the eighth installment of her prompt and useful publication of each year's epigraphical finds on Cyprus, Ino Nicolaou has given us the statue base of one Boethos son of Apollodoros, a stone found on the site of ancient Kition. 1) Its text is

[δ δείνα τοῦ δείνα ——] τοῦ φίλου [τοῦ]
βασιλέως Βοηθίου Ἀπολλοδόρου
τῶν ἡγεμόνων
τοῦ ἐστιν τοῦ υἱοῦ

Mrs. Nicolaou dates the inscription to the middle of the second century B.C. on the basis of the letter forms.

The interpretation of this text poses some problems. 2) Mrs. Nicolaou remarks "Taking our inscription as it is, Boethos had under his orders the son of his honorant? We would indeed expect after τῶν ἡγεμόνων something like φίλου/τοῦ ἐστιν τοῦ υἱοῦ." The formula is indeed curious. First, the son of the dedicant, whose connection with the person honored is so paradigm, is not mentioned by name. A φίλος was not of a very exalted court position, only somewhat higher than a ἡγεμόν, 3) and his son would hardly, if under the command of a ἡγεμόν, be of such eminence that his name would need no

---

* I am indebted to Thomas Drew-Bear and Alan E. Samuel for reading parts of this article, and to the Canada Council and the University of Toronto for the financial support that made its writing possible.


2) The text itself is assured by Mrs. Nicolaou's photograph and controlled by my study of the stone and squeeze of it in the Larnaca District Museum in January 1971. I am indebted to Mrs. Nicolaou for her generous assistance to me on this occasion.

3) Mrs. Nicolaou, in her commentary (p. 85) remarks "On the available evidence the court rank of an ἡγεμόν ἐπὶ ἀνδρῶν was that of τῶν διαδόχων." This is not in fact the case. Only one inscription can be cited in support of this statement, a dedication of Old Paphos, BSA 56, 1961, no. 49, honoring a man with the court rank τῶν διαδόχων. T. B. Mitford has suggested (ἡγεμόνα ἐπὶ ἀνδρῶν) as a restoration here, but the restoration is by no means certain and does not deserve to be used as evidence in this way.
mention. Mrs. Nicolaou’s expected ἄλοι/ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὦλο is open to the same criticism.

But it is the relationship of Boethos to the son that creates the greatest problem. Τῶν ἰγεμόνων τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὦλο can scarcely bear the meaning Mrs. Nicolaou gives it: the son might be subject to one hegemon, but scarcely to a college of ἰγεμόνων of whom Boethos was one. On the other hand, if it were the son who commanded the hegemones, the son could only be of very high rank — an ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως or strategos (and hence at least τῶν πρῶτων φίλων in court rank), in which case one cannot understand the omission of the son’s name and the prominent flaunting of his father’s lower rank. The son, however, cannot command the hegemones. A preposition of subordination, ὑπὸ, is demanded in such a case to express the relationship between commanded and commander; we would then have something like τῶν ἰγεμόνων τῶν τασσόμενων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὦλο.

There is, in sum, no satisfactory interpretation of the text as it stands; nor is it possible to challenge any of the editor’s readings. The difficulties raised can all, however, be solved by assumption of a lacide’s error in the last line: one would read τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὦλο. Boethos is himself the son, and the normal formula of a dedicatory inscription with a family member as object is evident: Χ honors Γ, one of the hegemones, his own son.

From this correction we may proceed to the completion of line 1. Since Boethos’ father’s name is Apollodoros, that name must begin the line; and indeed, the editor’s description of the line (confirmed in every point by my examination of the stone and my squeeze) permits this: “In l. 1, the surviving letters are all damaged on top. At the beginning before tau, the lower part of an upright can be traced. Before this, after a space for about two letters, the lower part of a nu preceded by a horizontal stroke.” The space before this horizontal stroke corresponds to a space of ten letters in the next line, and it is therefore suitable to restore Ἅπολλόδωρος.

Following the name is part of a nu, space for two (or perhaps three) letters, and then part of an upright stroke. This word, which can hardly be other than the patronymic, cannot have ended with any letter that this trace could represent except epsilon, and the restoration of an omicron before it is therefore necessary. One may read the inscription as a whole as
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[Ἀπολλόδωρος Ἡλιεῖς τῶν φίλων τοῦ]

βασιλέως Βόθβων Ἀπολλοδώρου

τῶν Ἡγεμόνων

τῶν ἔστων ὑδάτω.

2. PTOLEMY VIII HONORED AT CYRENE

In the "Supplemento Epigrafico Cirenaico" published in Annuario n.s. 23-24, 1961-1962, G. Pugliese-Carratelli has edited from a photograph and the copy of G. Oliverio as number 117α (p. 289) a statue base of the Ptolemaic period, whose text he presents as follows:

[Βασιλέα Πτολεμαίου μέγαν θεόν Εὐεργέτην]

[τῶν Ἐπιφανῶν διάδοχοι, οἰκοταφώλαις]

[ἀργυρῶι συμβιβάζω, ὑπασπιστάμεθα, ἐπιλειποί καὶ πλείονες]

[ἐνυστίας ὁ δὲ εὐεργεσίας τῆς εἰς ἔστων.]

For the date, Pugliese-Carratelli indicates "Tolomeo III (247-222 A) ο T. VIII (176-117 A)." The sovereign here is certainly the latter, as a correct restoration of line 2 would have made clear: [θεόν Ἐπιφανῶν. This formula of parentage is the standard one in Ptolemaic royal inscriptions from an early date on, and is exemplified for Euergetes II by OGIS 128, among other texts. Ptolemy VIII began his rule as joint sovereign with his brother Philometor and sister Cleopatra II in 170/69 (not 176) and always dated his regnal years from that time, but he did not at this time call himself θεός Εὐεργέτης. 4) As late as 155, at the publication of his will leaving his kingdom to Rame, 5) he still called himself Βασιλεῖς Πτολεμαίων βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου καὶ βασιλέσσης Κλεοπάτρας, θεόν Ἐπιφανῶν, δ νεώτερος: Ptolemy the younger. It in fact appears that the title Euergetes was probably not taken until after his accession to power in Egypt in 145, for no document certainly of the years before 145 bears that title. The date of our inscription can, therefore, be narrowed with reasonable certainty to 145-116.


One may also doubt the restoration of the beginning of line 4. In general έυνοια is not found in Ptolemaic dedications with reference to the kings; rather it is more usually a term used of the attitude of a subject toward the sovereign. 6) In addition, it is generally provided with an object; and the amount lost at least ought to be five or six letters, rather than the seven requires by [έυνοιασ]. 7) Motives other than έυπρέπεια are in any case rare on statue bases of Ptolemaic kings, and speculation on what is to be restored here does not seem helpful.

3. EGYPTIAN SOLDIERS IN CRETE

An inscription of Gortyn, I. Cret. IV 195, records a decree of that city honoring a force of Egyptian soldiers sent by Ptolemy VI to aid in a Gortynian war with Knossos. Part of the text lists the names of these soldiers. Of the three fragments united by Guarducci to form the inscription, the latter two had already been published, whereas the first part of the decree was presented for the first time. It is with the third fragment that I am concerned here, for it is the least well-preserved and least satisfactorily restored.

The transcription of fragment (c) is due to F. Halbherr, 8) who preserved the following copy:


7) The number of letters to the left of an imaginary line through the first complete letter in each line of the inscription (which are vertically aligned) is 6 in line 1 and 5 in lines 2 (correctly restored) and 3, while in line 1, iota was one of the six letters. A seven letter word is thus unlikely here. Mitford (note 6) notes that έυνοια does not appear on Cyprus without an object of the loyalty until the end of Euergetes' reign, and then only because of the peculiar circumstances of the presence of a separate king in Cyprus.

8) Mon. Ant. 1, 1889, pp. 59, 61, no. 4.
Halbherr did not try to provide an edition beyond this format. In 1911, A. J. Reinach discussed the fragment in an article in which he showed that several Egyptian names could be restored on the basis of Halbherr's readings. It is largely on this study that Guarducci relied in giving her own text:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ΕΩΤΟΣ} \\
\text{ΑΜΦΙΩΜΙΚ} \\
\text{ΦΝΕΦΟΡΝ} \\
\text{ΤΟΣΙΡΙΟΣ} \\
\text{ΕΝΟΦΟ} \\
\text{ΝΟΥ} \\
\text{ΥΧΙ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

This text is unsatisfactory on two counts: the length of the line provided and the names restored. Guarducci assumes a line length of about 18–20 letters in the longer names, about 16 in shorter. But the fragment (b) indicates a length about three letters shorter. And many of the names restored are not known or plausible Egyptian names; we now have more complete works on names than those that Reinach used (BGU, Wilcken, Ostraka, and Spiegelberg, Aeg. u. Griech. Eigennamen).
In the circumstances, I attempted to find the surviving fragment of (c) in the Heraklion museum, where Miss Guarducci reported it kept. My attempt was unsuccessful, but a friend, Ian Begg, later located it during a stay in Heraklion and examined and photographed it for me. 11) About a half of the fragment now survives, including the last letter of line 7 and the remainder (lines 8-16) of the text, less some letters now chipped away at the right in lines 10-14. The left edge, too, seems somewhat damaged. I present here my text of the entire fragment, followed by a commentary.

[...]

11) I am indebted to James R. McCredie, Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, for his assistance in securing the requisite permit and to Ian Begg of the University of Toronto for his labors on my behalf.
1-3. Guarducci used a line beginning some three letters to the left of the first letter on Halbherr's copy. She thus accepted the name Νεφερπετος, which does not exist. Ερειθος, however, is a very common name. When one joins to this the fact that both lines 1 and 3 certainly begin with Πετε-, that most common Egyptian opening of male names, and that the opening πις of both align exactly with the first epsilon of Ερειθος, it is clear that the text begins here and that several letters are not to be restored to the left. Reinach's Πετετος, which Guarducci prints but doubts, is not a necessary restoration, although it is possible. The patronymic in line 2 could be any of several names; I have therefore not restored it. As for ΔΡΕΩΠ of line 3, I cannot find a suitable name ('Αρεώρος does not exist), and the stone is now lost.

4. Πετετος does not exist, but Τεθος is common, and six letters or so are thus left for the name.

6. Several names beginning in Παχω- are known, some more likely than Παχώμος, rare and late as it is. Παχος is an example.

8. Ψεννηθος does not exist, but Ψεννηθος does. No diagonal stroke is visible in the nu, but that is true in the nu of line 14 as well.

9. Only ΗΟΥΣ can be read with confidence. Reinach's Αρεωρος and Αρεκχος do not exist.

10. Πετετος does not exist (cf. line 4); Τεθος is probably here too a name by itself.

11. The correct nominative is 'Αμφιμος, not 'Αμφιμος.

12. The name Πετεφερφω does not exist. The letter after phi appears to be an epsilon, yielding the common name Νεφερης.

14. The first omicron appears correct, but Egyptian names habitually have omega in this place. I cannot parallel the ending.
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