

R. S. BAGNALL AND T. DREW-BEAR

Notes on the History of Kourion

Extrait de la *Chronique d'Égypte*.
Tome XLIX, No. 97, 1974

BRUXELLES
1974

SOMMAIRE

FONDATION ÉGYPTOLOGIQUE REINE ÉLISABETH

Comité de Patronage. Conseil d'Administration. Personnel. Nouveaux membres. Membres décédés	3
Séance académique du lundi 29 octobre 1973	5
Assemblée générale	6

ÉGYPTE PHARAONIQUE

Études

R. TEFNIN, À propos d'une tête royale du Musée d'Aberdeen	13
J. R. HARRIS, Kiya	25
W. DECKER, La délégation des Eléens en Égypte sous la 26 ^e dynastie (Hér. II 160 - Diod. I 95)	31
G. VITTMANN, Zwei Königinnen der Spätzeit namens Chedebuitjerbōne	43
M. DEWACHTER, Un bloc du « temple haut » de Karnak Nord au Musée de Grenoble	52
J. QUAEGBEUR, Inventaire des stèles funéraires memphites d'époque ptolémaïque	59

Livres

W. R. DAWSON & ER. P. UPHILL, <i>Who was who in Egyptology</i> (B. van de Walle)	80
J.-Fr. CHAMPOLLION, <i>Notices descriptives</i> (Reproduction de l'édition originale) (B. van de Walle)	85
<i>The Literature of Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, and Poetry</i> (M. Dewachter)	87
H. A. GROENEWEGEN-FRANKFORT, <i>Arrest and Movement. An Essay on Space and Time in the representational Art of the Ancient Near East</i> (Cl. Vandersleyen)	90
W. WOLF, <i>Frühe Hochkulturen: Ägypten, Mesopotamien, Ägäis</i> (A. Makhitarian)	92
W. DECKER, <i>Die physische Leistung Pharaos. Untersuchungen zu Heidentum, Jagd und Leibesübungen der ägyptischen Könige</i> (B. van de Walle)	93
S. BOSTICCO, <i>Museo Archeologico di Firenze: Le Stele Egiziane di Epoca Tarda</i> (H. De Meulenaere)	96
L. HABACHI, <i>The Second Stela of Kamose and his Struggle against the Hyksos Ruler and his Capital</i> (R. Hari)	98
S. RATIÉ, <i>La Reine-Pharaon</i> (A. Rammant-Peeters)	102
A. R. DAVID, <i>Religious Ritual at Abydos (c. 1300 B.C.)</i> (L. H. Lesko)	103

Voir suite, couverture p. 3.

Notes on the History of Kourion

THE recent publication of T. B. Mitford's *Inscriptions of Kourion*⁽¹⁾ has given us, despite that work's defects⁽²⁾, a body of material for study of this Cypriot city rivalled by none of the other small cities of the island for its amplitude and availability. In the following paper we will study several aspects of the history of the city which receive a less than satisfactory treatment at the hands of the editor of these inscriptions.

1. A Ptolemaic Commandant?

I. Kourion 32 is a fragmentary honorific decree for a Sidonian, the text of which is presented as follows:

[L — βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου
[τοῦ Πτολεμαίου, μηρός] Δαισίου α'· ?
[Ἐδόξεν Κορυαίων τῆι βουλήι·
4 [οἱ ἄρχοντες] ἐπέβαν· Ἐπειδὴ
[ὁ δαίνα — — —]· Σιδώνιος,
[ὁ γενόμενος ἐπὶ] τῆς πόλεως
[φροσβάρχος], πρᾶσσαν τὰ βέλ-
8 [τιστα] καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ
[διετέλει] περὶ τοὺς πολίτας
[ἡμῶν ἐν οἷς] ? γεγένηται ἐπ' α-
[ὑτῶν κρα]τῶν?, ἔνεκεν ἀρε-
12 [τῆς καὶ ἀνδραγαθίας τῆς
[εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς πο-
[λίτας]·] εἶναι ἀβ[τὸν] π[ολ]-
[ίτην καὶ] εὐεργέ[την καὶ τοὺς]

(1) *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 83, 1971. We have collaborated on this article as a whole, but primary responsibility for section 1 rests with Bagnall and that for sections 2 and 3 with Drew-Bear.

(2) On the editorial methods and contents of this volume, see our article in *Phoenix* 27 (1973), pp. 99-117 and 213-244, and articles by Drew-Bear (*BASP*, 9, 1972, pp. 85-107) on the curse tablets, Chr. Habicht (*Guarducci Festschrift*), forthcoming on no. 42, and W. D. Lebek (*ZPE* 12, 1973, pp. 101-137) on no. 104.

16 [ἐκγόνου] ἀδ[ού, στήσαι δέ]
[αὐτοῦ καὶ ε]λε[ύνα — — — —]

Of the letter forms, the editor remarks, « these suggest the third quarter of the third century B.C. »

As restored, the decree begins with a dating formula of which Mitford says, « This decree doubtless opened with the year-sign L (Avi-Yonah, p. 114), current in Cyprus from at least the time of the first Euergetes (T. B. Mitford, *Class. Quart.* 44 (1950) : p. 99, n. 2), followed by the regnal year of a Ptolemy part of whose name survives at the end of line 1. The patronymic of Euergetes, whom we have already found reason to expect (?), adequately fills the *lacunae*, so that it is very probable that our inscription falls between the years 246 and 221 B.C. »

There are a number of problems here. First, all known dated decrees from the Ptolemaic-controlled cities begin with a standard formula, which is the same as that used in Egypt (?): βασιλεύοντος; Ptolemy son of so-and-so, year x, month y. The year, whether represented by the word ἔτους; or the sign L, never precedes the word βασιλεύοντος, as in this restoration. Secondly, this restoration yields a line length of 24 or 25 letters, while the more securely restorable lines of the inscription do not exceed the limits of 20 to 23. This objection is, of course, not conclusive, but it indicates the likelihood of a slightly shorter line length and hence restoration.

These observations suggest that a restoration of

[βασιλεύοντος; Πτο]λεμαίου
[τοῦ Πτολεμαίου L — —] Δαισίου α'

would be clearly preferable. The word μνησ is not essential. The line lengths in this restoration would be 22 (line 1) and 23 or 24 (line 2), depending on the regnal year number, while the photograph published in *I. Kourion* shows that the last letter of the second line is crowded in at the end of the line.

(1) This « reason » is presumably the date of « third quarter of the third century B.C. » quoted above for the letter forms.

(2) For these, see L. ROBERT, *Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale*, pp. 53-55, esp. p. 54, nn. 6-8. The Egyptian examples may be found in *Wörterbuch III*, pp. 33-34; more recent finds add nothing.

The editor has, as we have seen, suggested that Ptolemy III Euergetes was the sovereign represented by the phrase Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου, with the allegation that this was Euergetes' patronymic. And so it was; but « son of Ptolemy » was equally the patronymic of every Ptolemy except the first. And in fact, the dating formulas call Euergetes « Ptolemy son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the Theoi Adelpoi »; it is Ptolemy II Philadelphos who is called simply « Ptolemy son of Ptolemy » (?). This is as true of the overseas possessions of the Ptolemies as of Egypt (?). If Mitford is to identify this king as Euergetes, then, the burden of proof is upon him. One may safely conclude that the reign in question is that of Philadelphos, and nothing in the letter forms forbids this date.

The beginning of the decree, after the dating formula, is read and restored [Ἐδοξεν Κορυθίων τῆς βουλῆς · | [οἱ ἀρχοντες εἰπ]αν (?). The mention of the *boule* alone leads the editor to argue that Kourion (like Paphos) had an oligarchic constitution. This may be true, but that the mention of πόλις; (line 6) and πολίτας; (line 9) reinforce this conclusion (as Mitford states) is not the case: rather, the former word is (on Mitford's restoration) part of the honorand's royal title, while the latter is a typical part of the banal phraseology of such decrees and reflects no special situation.

The considerations begin, on the editor's restoration, Ἐπειδὴ | [δ δεῖνα — —]; Σιδώνιος. | [δ γενόμενος ἐπ] τῆς πόλις; | [φρούραρχος]. The ethnic Sidonian (?) provides the point of departure for a curious excursus (p. 76): « Sidon, conquered by the Ptolemies in 275 B.C., the seat of a Ptolemaic mint by 261 and their chief garrison city in Phoenicia until the morrow of their decisive defeat at Panion in 200 B.C., was famed as a mercenary center. The Sidonian we here encounter was, we may conjecture, not a Hellenized native, but a military settler, probably of the second generation ». Mitford cites Launey and Rostovtzeff for his assertions about the garrison; but they deal

(1) Cf. *Wörterbuch III*, pp. 33-34.

(2) This point is made by J. and L. ROBERT in *Mélanges Isidore Lévy, Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves*, 13, 1953, pp. 560-561.

(3) The placement of a period here is incorrect: cf. the remarks of J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull. épigr.* 1949, 1, and our review article cited in n. 2, p. 179.

(4) This Sidonian is registered in I. ΝΙΣΤΟΛΑΟΥ, *Κυπριακαὶ Στρούδαι* 32, 1968, p. 38, no. 33, which should be added to the list of works mentioning this document in the lemma in *I. Kourion*.

only with foreigners in the garrison of Sidon, men who retained their own nationality in the *politeumata*. There is no evidence for such soldiers becoming citizens of Sidon and using Sidonian as their ethnic (?). And finding a Sidonian in Ptolemaic service should not be so great a surprise as the editor thinks; one may cite, for example, Philokles, king of Sidon, prominent as a military commander for the Ptolemies(?).

It is, however, dubious that this man was in royal service at all, for the restoration of his title is entirely without foundation. The editor remarks of line 6, «iota is preceded by what would appear to be the bottom of an upright, so spaced as to admit rho. This mark, however, may well be casual». There is no reason to accept the claim that this stroke is «casual», and Mitford himself (p. 76) says, «in line 6 [πε]ρί we have noted as epigraphically a very possible alternative to [ἐπ]ί.» Since *περὶ τῆς πόλεως* is not particularly out of place, it is difficult to see why, as the physically preferable reading, it should not be adopted. In this case, the entire titlature of the individual is to be eliminated, since *προσφραγχο* would now in line 7 be entirely isolated and without sense, while there is not room for it in line 6 after allowing for a definite article preceding it.

Of the following lines, the editor is undoubtedly right that the participle *πράσσω* requires *διετέλει*, as is usual in the phraseology of honorific decrees. The most natural place for it would be in the lacuna of line 7, preceding *πράσσω*. Since *γεγένηται* is, like *διετέλει*, a finite verb, a conjunction somewhere before it (since none follows it) is necessary, and it is very likely that a *καί* stood in line 9. The consequence of this is that the peculiar restoration of line 10 must be replaced by an adjective or a noun accompanying *γεγένηται* to explain what it was that this Sidonian has shown himself to be.

Of lines 10-13 the editor comments, «the supplements of lines 10 and 11 (which I take to mean «in the matters wherein he has been their superior») are questionable; and the position of *ἔνεκεν* before its noun, although not unknown in the prose authors of the fourth century B.C.,

(1) The editor's date for the Ptolemaic conquest of Sidon is also in error: the correct date is 287/6, when the city was taken from Demetrius. See E. T. NEWELL, *Tyros Rediviva* (1923) and E. MANN, *Demetrio Poliorcete* (1951), p. 57, n. 32.

(2) *Pros. Ptol.* 15085. Philokles is admittedly an exceptional figure, but several other Sidonians found in various roles in the Ptolemaic kingdom may be found in F. M. HEICHELHEIM, *Die Auswärtige Bevölkerung*² (1963).

I am unable to parallel epigraphically». On the latter point, it suffices to cite a Theraean inscription of the second century B.C., *IG XII 3 466 II*, lines 5 ff.: *ἔνεκεν τῆς εἰχεν καλο[κα]γαθίας εἰς τοὺς στρατιώ-
τας κατ' ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν*. More curious — and worthy of the editor's doubts — is the placement of the entire *ἔνεκεν* phrase, connected very tenuously as it is with the syntax of the decree. And the supplements of lines 10-11 are, in truth, peculiar: they are not Greek.

The matter may be resolved by reading lines 10 ff. as follows:

10 [ca. 7]: γεγένηται, ἐπα-
[ρέσαι ἀπ]τόν ἔνεκεν ἀρε-
[τῆς καὶ ἀνδραγαθίας τῆς
[εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς πο-
14 [λίτας καὶ] εἶναι ἀπ[τόν] ἀολί]-
[την κτλ

As to line lengths, line 10 is now ca. 22 letters, line 11 is still 19 letters (the last three letters are spread over an unusually large area), and line 14 becomes 22 instead of 20 letters. It is possible to see on the photograph what appears to be the top of an *iota* at the end of line 10. The photograph is not, however, sufficiently clear to allow us to judge the substitution of *omicron* for *omega* in line 11, which should be verified on the stone; but this passage now makes connected sense and follows an intelligible Greek sentence order typical of this clause in honorific decrees.

2. Multiple gymnasia at Kourion?

In commenting on *I. Kourion* 46, an inscription from the second century B.C. erected by [οἱ ἀπὸ γυμ]νασί[ων] in honor of a man and his sons, Mitford states, «the gymnasium at Kourion — it is somewhat surprising to note — is not as such elsewhere attested». What is surprising is this sentence itself, since no. 76, dated with hesitation in *I. Kourion* to the early part of the reign of Augustus, begins, on the editor's restoration, with the following lines:

[Ἀγαθ]ῆι Τύχηι
[Ἐδοξε τῶι κολολληγίωι τῶν ἀπὸ γυμνασί[ων]
[ἐφήβων? πρώ]του? ἐπανέσαι τε τὸν προ-
4 [στάτην ἀπῶ]ν Ἐλλόφιλον κτλ

The editor comments (p. 143): « It is of interest to find that Kourion at this date was large enough to possess more than one gymnasium. Salamis in middle Hellenistic times had at least three ».

A number of problems arise here. As his basis for the statement about Salamis, Mitford cites M. L. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (1897) no. 99, who depended in turn on an edition by Waddington (no. 2756) of a dedication at Salamis to a Ptolemaic official apparently emanating from οἱ ἔφηβοι (?) οἱ ἐκ γυμνασίου τρι[των]. The document in question was, however, re-edited (with a photograph) in 1966 by J. Pouilloux, in an article entitled precisely « Les trois gymnases de Salamine de Chypre » (4); Pouilloux showed (after J. Delorme) that the line cited must be restored as follows: οἱ ἔφηβοι καὶ οἱ ἐκ γυμνασίου Τριτ[—] — name, patronymic and ethnic (?). Although the correction by Pouilloux has been subsequently accepted (?), *I. Kourion* (which is dated and appeared in 1971) ignores an article of 1966 and presents without change the state of the question as it was in 1897.

To add to the confusion, no cross-reference is given in the remark on no. 76 to the commentary on no. 46 (we have already seen that the editor did not make any connection between the two), where Mitford's own version of the Salaminian inscription is to be found: « LeBas-Wadd., no. 2756, where, however, we have, on my restoration, οἱ ἑπιλομάχοι? οἱ ἐκ γυμνασίου τρι[των]. » Although Mitford does not state this fact here, he had seen the stone himself many years before (5). Since the restoration of Pouilloux is certainly correct, it is equally clear that this dotted *omicron* must be regarded as imaginary. It is regrettable that in a book published in 1971 these ἑπιλομάχοι οἱ ἐκ γυμνασίου τρι[των] should be launched on their career without any regard for the correct restoration published five years earlier.

If the Salaminian gymnasia cited as corroborating evidence are fictional, so equally are those of Kourion. In his commentary on the first line of no. 76, Mitford continues: « Nevertheless, despite this plurality of *gymnasia* — for that our inscription proves, whether [πρω]των or [τρι]των or even [τετρα]των be the correct restoration — the office

(1) *Rev. arch.* 1966, pp. 337-340.

(2) For the correct restoration of the beginning of the line see J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull. épigr.* 1968, 571.

(3) P. ROESCH, *BCH* 95 (1971) 577; cf. *SEG* XXV 1037 (the restoration at the beginning of the line is tacitly suppressed in *SEG*).

(4) *Op. Ath.* 1, 1953, p. 54, n. 79.

of gymnasiarch is notably uncommon at Kourion (6). In fact one may doubt that this inscription proves the existence of a plurality of gymnasia at Kourion; for the editor himself admits that his restoration [ἐφήβων] at the beginning of the third line is uncertain (?), and with regard to the syntax of the entire phrase the remarks of Pouilloux (7) on the inscription of Salamis are worth repeating here: « Au demeurant, la restitution τρι[των] qui s'était imposée comme d'elle-même avec la première publication n'était guère d'une syntaxe satisfaisante. Se fût-il agi d'un ordinal, il eût été plus attendu de l'accompagner de l'article et de l'intercaler entre l'article et le nom ». Restoration and conclusions in *I. Kourion* 76 are alike unconvincing.

The middle portion of the same inscription is presented by the editor as follows:

- ἐπιπέσει τε τὸν προ-
- 4 [σάτην αὐτῶ]ν Ἐλλοφίλον καὶ στεφανῶσα[ι]
[αὐτὸν καὶ τ]οῦς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδην
[— — — — —] Ὀνησιζλήν τῶι τῆς ἀρετῆς
[αὐτῶν (?) στεφ]άνου· αὐτοῦ δὲ Ἐλλοφίλον
- 8 [ἀναθεῖναι] ἀνδριάντα χαλκοῦν ἐν τῶι
[ἐπισημασ]τῶι τοῦ γυμνασίου τόποι·

(1) By thus admitting [τρι]των and [τετρα]των as possible restorations, Mitford tacitly abandons the view expressed in his first edition of this document, *Op. Arch.* 6, 1950, p. 66: « [ἐφήβων? τρι]των? and [νέων? τετρα]των?, epigraphically satisfactory alternatives, give too many gymnasia for a city as small as Curium. »

(2) Surely it is erroneous. Note that the inscription at Salamis mentions two groups, οἱ ἔφηβοι and οἱ ἐκ γυμνασίου.

(3) *Rev. arch.* 1966, p. 339.

(4) Mitford comments (p. 142): « The supplements αὐτῶν and ἀναθεῖναι in lines 7 and 8 respectively replace my original ἀξίωι and ἀναστήσαι in deference to Professor Robert's strictures. » It is important to distinguish: the second of these two restorations ([ἀναθεῖναι] ἀνδριάντα χαλκῆ) is due to J. and L. Robert, whereas the first is suggested in *I. Kourion*. The reference to « Professor Robert's strictures » is to the discussion of the first edition of this document (n. 1, above) which appeared in *Bull. épigr.* 1951, p. 204. The *Bulletin*, however, is written by Jeanne and Louis Robert, as these authors have had occasion to point out (cf. *REG* 71 [1958] xv, and for Mitford, *Bull. épigr.* 1963, 306); in the passage referred to for this text one reads precisely: « le supplément ἀξίωι nous paraît suspect; on a plusieurs exemples de ὁ τῆς ἀρετῆς στεφανος » (cf. for example Ad. WILHELM, *Anz. Wien* 65, 1928, pp. 129-137, for the idiom of the genitive with στεφανος, e.g. στεφανος φιλοτιμίας, εὐνοίας, etc.; the personal pronoun αὐτῶν has no place here).

[ὁμοίως δὲ ἀ]ραθῆναι καὶ εἰκόνα γραπτῆν ἐν
[ἀσπιδίοι ἐπιζῶσσοι (?) κτλ.

On the noun *προστάτης*, restored in lines 3-4, the editor comments (p. 143): « the title *προστάτης τοῦ γυμνασίου*, although occurring here only for Kourion, abroad is well attested. Cf. for example, π. τοῦ γυμνασίου at Branchidae (CIG 2882, l. 16) ». This same reference to an inscription of « Branchidae » is the first entry in LSJ s.v. *προστάτης* 3, « president or presiding officer »⁽¹⁾; but one may note that the Corpus of the inscriptions of « Branchidae » appeared in 1958 (A. Rehm, *In-schriften von Didyma*) and that the document cited duly appears therein as no. 84, with commentary on pp. 114-115. Furthermore, the inscription from Kourion under discussion actually does not attest a *προστάτης τοῦ γυμνασίου* at Kourion; what it attests according to the restorations is a *προστάτης τοῦ κολληγίου τῶν ἀπὸ γυμνασίου ἐφήβων πρώτου* (vel sim.) — if one is willing to accept such an institution and such Greek. Once again there is no cross-reference to no. 46, where the honorand is described on the editor's restoration as *ἐπιστάτην ἑαυτῶν* (scil. τῶν ἀπὸ γυμνασίου), although in a note to no. 76 Mitford asserts that « *ἐπιστάτης* . . . would appear to be the proper title for the deputy or substitute to a gymnasiarch who has defaulted on his duties or has been unable to perform them ». A different interpretation of this office appears (p. 102) in the commentary to no. 46: « It is of interest to find that they recognize a chief, presumably of their own appointing, other than the normal civic gymnasiarch: in itself an indication of some power and independence ». What is clear is that we know very little about the offices of the gymnasium of Kourion, and that the mutually exclusive hypotheses of the editor are equally vain in the present state of our knowledge.

The failure of the editor to make a connection between nos. 46 and 76 produces yet more confusion in the commentary to the former text when Mitford discusses the role of the gymnasium:

(1) For the restoration [ἀ]ραθῆναι καὶ εἰκόνα γραπτῆν ἐν [ἀσπιδίοι ἐπιζῶσσοι in lines 10-11, it would have been useful to refer to the parallels collected by J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull. épigr.* 1951, 236 (on a previous publication by Mitford).

(2) The other references cited by the dictionary for this section concern *προστάται* of religious organizations, a *σύνδοκος* of *βασιλικαί* in Egypt (OGIS 130), the Iobacchi at Athens (IG II² 1368), and a *θίασος* of *Διονυσιασταί* at Teos (SEG IV 598).

Throughout the Hellenistic East and notably within the Ptolemaic Empire the gymnasium was a focus, not merely of Hellenism, but of loyalty to the regime. More particularly, there was an intimate connection between the military, both mercenaries and settlers, and this institution... These *ἀπὸ γυμνασίου*, I would emphasize, belong to the reigns of Euergetes I, Philopator and Philometor — to a period, in short, when the island's garrison, still composed to a substantial degree of military settlers, was both large and influential... They are not to be found after Euergetes II had relieved the cities of Cyprus, with the exception of Paphos, Salamis, and possibly Kition, of their *φρούρια*, and making a clean break with the organization of his predecessors, relied solely upon mercenaries imported from outside the Ptolemaic empire. There would seem, then, little doubt that these anonymous « members of the gymnasium » were predominantly military: but there is no reason to think that in Cyprus they infringed — as they did on occasion elsewhere — on the rights of their city's council and its magistrates.

As we have seen, however, the *ἀπὸ γυμνασίου* survive long past the reign of Philometor at Kourion, in no. 76, and the assertion that they disappear with the garrison is thus groundless. But while one will not doubt the connection of the gymnasium and the military forces in the Ptolemaic empire, one may be skeptical that the *ἀπὸ γυμνασίου* were « predominantly military ». With or without a garrison, a Greek city would have a gymnasium, and that gymnasium would have a presiding officer of some sort, ephebes, and alumni — for that is what the *ἀπὸ γυμνασίου* or *ἐκ γυμνασίου* (as at Salamis, where they are distinguished from the ephebes) were⁽¹⁾. As for the idea that the groups elsewhere « infringed on the rights » of the council and magistrates, Mitford cites no examples of such actions; in fact, any assembly, whether it met regularly as an institution or only a single time, could pass decrees and order them to be inscribed upon stone or commission the erection

(1) Cf. the lucid comments of M. Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* II, pp. 1059-1060: « But... of the gymnasia in the foreign communities of Egypt was not confined to the education of the young. The gymnasia were as important in the life of the adult Greeks as in that of their children. They were the rallying-point of all those who themselves had received Greek education. *οἱ ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου*... Since the chief supporters of the gymnasium were on the one hand the cities and on the other the army, especially the settled soldiers, the associations of *οἱ ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου* were closely connected with the cities and with the various communities, mostly clerical, the *politai*, which were certainly as much 'political' as military institutions ». In Cyprus, a land far longer hellenized than Egypt, one must not suppose a smaller role for the Greek cities in the life of their own gymnasia.

of honorific statues, all this without infringing upon the prerogatives of the civic authorities.

3. A proconsul of Cyprus and a « visit of Trajan »

I. *Kourion* 87 is a block of pitted sandstone with the dedication of a statue of the proconsul Q. Seppius Celer M. Titius Sassius Candidus, previously published (1) with Σεσ[τ]ίωι in place of Σεπ[π]ίωι and {T. ?} (2) in place of [K.]. Seppius is now known also from no. 111, published here for the first time, which gives the correct form of his name and establishes the correct date: the reign of Trajan, precisely 113/4 or 114/5 (3).

The *cursum* of Seppius Celer, as read and restored in both publications (4), presents a curious anomaly, for he is said to have been

ταμίε δῆμον
 Ῥωμαίων, δημόσων, ἐκ προεβ-
 [ε]ν[τ]οῦ ἐπ[ι]αρχείας; ἀνθεπ[ι]άτρωι

Mitford comments (p. 163): « The words ἐκ προεβ[ε]ν[τ]οῦ ἐπ[ι]αρχείας; ἀνθεπ[ι]άτρωι I take together, to denote that this man from being merely *legatus provinciae* (προεβεντής, προεβεντή; ἀντιστρατήγος) was promoted directly to the proconsulship, omitting the praetorship. But not merely is such *adlectio inter praelorios* rare — in the inscriptions it is regularly reported, as a mark of Imperial favor, in terms much more explicit. Our unusual phrase... seemingly indicates that Seppius Celer served consecutively both as legate and as proconsul in Cyprus: an arrangement so abnormal as to indicate some special circumstance, now lost to us ». In the first publication of this text, this « special circumstance » was explained as follows (p. 70): « We may here note that Marcus freely exercised his right of *adlectio* both *inter quaestorios* and

(1) *Op. Arch.* 6, 1950, pp. 68-70, no. 37.

(2) The reason why Mitford chose to restore this *praenomen* is not apparent.

(3) In his first publication of no. 87 Mitford had dated the inscription according to his judgment of the letter forms: « Notable are alpha with the straight cross-bar, rho with the rounded top, omega large and open; omikron towards the end of l. 2 very small, and probably under average size throughout the inscription ». He concluded that « on the strength of these forms I would ascribe this document tentatively to the Antonine period, and perhaps to the reign of Marcus ».

(4) No change was made in this portion of the text in the second edition.

inter praelorios; and further, that it was in his reign that the tranquility which the adjacent mainland had enjoyed for nearly fifty years was broken, first by the Parthian wars and subsequently by the revolt of Avidius Cassius ». But since no. 111 now renders it necessary to renounce for this proconsul the reign of Marcus Aurelius in favor of that of Trajan, the « special circumstance » requires a new explanation (p. 164): « With the Parthian war impending it may well be that Trajan, unwilling to take Cyprus from the Senate by imposing a *legatus Augusti*, arranged the promotion of a subordinate official who had both recent experience of the province and his confidence... Trajan was at pains to secure his rear by having in the one oriental province not directly under his control at least a governor of his own choice ». However, students of Roman administration may be reluctant to accept both the Greek in the phrase ἐκ προεβεντοῦ ἐπ[ι]αρχείας ἀνθεπ[ι]άτρωι (2) and these elaborations of it (3).

Furthermore, with regard to this proconsul one reads on page 163 that « not only is he himself otherwise unknown to us (2), but so also, I believe, is the *gentilicium* Seppius; while Sassius is very uncommon ». This is an astonishing assertion. In the *RE* is an article s.v. Seppius (« oskischer Vorname ») by F. Münzer (4); another article by A. Stein on C. Seppius Rufus (registered in Preisigke's *Namenbuch* s.v. Σέππιος), who held the position of head of the *idios logos* in Egypt from A.D. 14 to 16 (5); and a third on « Seppius 1, Ziegler in den oberitalischen Alpen »; one may also consult for this Latin name the fundamen-

(1) This phrase is registered without comment in *Année épigraphique* (*Rev. arch.*) 1953, p. 213, no. 175.

(2) Thus W. Eck, *RE* Suppl. XIII, s.v. Seppius Ia, judges that « Es ist jedoch sehr unwahrscheinlich, dass Trajan einen Senator, der noch nicht einmal zur Praetur gelangt war, zum Prokonsul gemacht haben sollte ».

(3) Seppius is duly registered as proconsul of Cyprus by W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (1971), p. 223, with reference both to Mitford's first publication of this document and to his mention of it, together with the then unpublished no. 111, in *AJA* 65, 1961, p. 104, n. 46, where the name is tacitly corrected.

(4) Münzer cites, among other references, Seppius Loesius, who has an article in *RE* to himself.

(5) The sources are cited also by H.-G. PFLAUM, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres* III, p. 1084; cf. on Seppius Rufus G. W. BOWENSOCK, *Augustus and the Greek World*, p. 41, n. 5: « the *nomen* of the latter is Oscan ». See also P. R. SWAN-NEX, *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos* (*American Studies in Papyrology* 8, 1970), who collects the attestations on p. 127 (cf. also pp. 41 ff.).

tal work of W. Schulze (1). Sassius (for which no parallel is cited in *I. Kourion*) is Oscan as well, in particular Samnite (2).

No. 111, a previously unpublished document, is presented as follows :

Ἀπογρατῶρ Καίσαρ, Θεοῦ Νέρουα υἱός,
 Νέρουα; Τραιανός; Σεβαστός; Γερμανικός;
 Λαικός; ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημοκριτής;
 4 ἐξουσία; <τό> υἱ', ἀπογρατῶρ το ζ', ἔπατο; τὸ υἱ' (sic),
 πατὴρ πατρίδο; νννν Ἀπόλλωνι Ὑλάτη
 καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι Καίσαρι, ἐπὶ Κοίντου Σεπτίου
 Κέλεου; ἀθηπάτου, λιθόστρωτον
 8 κατεσκευ<α>σεν τὴν λείπονσαν ἀπὸ τῆς προ-
 ούσῃ; λιθοστρώτον μέχρι τοῦ φέροντο;
 εἰς τὴν Παρίαν ὁδὸν προπόλου, τῆς δαπάνης
 γενομένης; ἐκ τῶν βουλευτικῶν διαδομάτων
 12 καθὼς; ἡ Κοριεῖων βουλή ἐδογματίσεν· καὶ
 Κοίντου; Σέπτιου; Κέλ(ε)ρ ἀθηπάτου;
 συνεχώρησεν.

Since Trajan held the office of consul only six times, the indication ἔπατο; τὸ υἱ' in line 4 — emphasized in the text by *sic* — is surprising. In his commentary Mitford is less confident of his reading: « At the end of the line, where again *digamma* is to be expected, there are seemingly two letters. These traces suggest *iota* (or *upsilon*) *eta* ». The numeral presented with emphasis as completely certain in the text is by no means clearly visible on the accompanying photograph, and the editor himself comments « here we could safely emend to ζ (if indeed this number was not actually written) ». When the letters on a stone are thus uncertain, is it not necessary to indicate this fact, above all in an *editio princeps*, by printing them with dots in the text (3)?

(1) *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Abh. der kön. Ges. der Wiss. zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl. V 2: 1904): here the name is registered as Oscan on pp. 424 and 519; cf. the attestations in *CIL* XI cited on p. 277, n. 3.

(2) F. Münzer cites in *RE* *Sassia*, mother of Cicero's *Cluentius Habilius* from Larinum in Samnium, and a *Sassius* at Beneventum; the same two attestations in Schulze (n. 1), p. 369. *PIR*¹ registers Q. Tilius *Sassius*, a *frater arvulis* in the second half of the first century.

(3) A similar observation may be made with regard to the second numeral in the same line. In the text the indication ἀπογρατῶρ τὸ ζ' is printed as certain, but in the commentary we read: « the numeral following the Imperial acclamation has been obscured by damage to the stone. But a lower horizontal stroke, set above

The inscription twice mentions the proconsul whom we have already met, Q. Seppius Celer. According to the editor his proconsulship began on the evidence of the present document on 1 July of either A.D. 113 or 114. The former year is historically the more likely on this interpretation [referring to the conclusions drawn from no. 87]. But there is further evidence in favor of A.D. 113; our inscription states not merely that Q. Seppius Celer sanctioned expenditure on this pavement — but that the work was concluded within his term of office. If the inscription was cut not later than the end of September 114, the time required for this series of events surely precludes the possibility that our proconsul arrived at most some three months earlier. Even if this *terminus* of September is admitted, how many months can we reasonably assume were required for the completion of the pavement mentioned in the text? On page 218 of *I. Kourion* are discussed the location and length of this pavement (a reference to plan 2: « Sanctuary of Apollo Hylates » would have been helpful here). The editor concludes, on grounds that seem to us less than assured (2) — because there is no way of determining the location or the extent of the *προούση λιθόστρωτο*; — that « Trajan is now credited with extending this paving from the bottom of the Street westwards for some forty-five meters to the propylon ». How many months would have been necessary for what Mitford himself calls « a matter, to our thinking trivial — the

bases of the other letters, together with the absence of any trace of a cross-stroke, strongly supports *digamma*. Examination of the photograph appears to indicate that the stone is less damaged in this letter-space than Mitford asserts. Now Trajan's sixth acclamation is assigned to 106 and his seventh to 114; the date of this document is fixed in 114 by the clearly legible indication in line 4 of the emperor's tribunician power held for the eighteenth time. Mitford dates the inscription before the last months of this year on the ground that when it was composed news of the seventh acclamation had not yet reached Cyprus; but it is unclear on the photograph whether the stone does in fact read here ζ', or whether the stonemason, unsure about the correct number of acclamations, cut only the low horizontal stroke (which is all that is clearly visible) and never engraved a complete letter in this space.

(1) From the present inscription (with our no. 106) I infer that from the Kourion Gate to the bottom of the Street and thence to the Temple of Apollo, the road was already paved; but neither this inscription nor no. 106 (a fragment in Latin with *stratum*) contains evidence to support this inference.

paving of a mere forty-seven yards (?) of roadway? Surely it is not safe to argue that this could not have been accomplished within three months, and even less safe to use this argument as evidence for the date of Seppius Celer's proconsulship.

Mitford continues, « Here we may indulge in a profitable speculation » and advances the hypothesis that Trajan visited Kourion in the winter of 113 on the way to Antioch in Syria. In this hypothesis he finds another piece of evidence to support the date of January-June 114 which he assigns to this document: « This would indeed explain how the unpaved portion of the way came at this precise time to be completed: the winter rains had doubtless fallen, and we can appreciate the mortification of the city fathers at having the god enter his own temple for the first time over an unseamly expanse of mud. The βουλή thereupon votes the money, the proconsul sanctions the expenditure, and the work is concluded before the mid-summer of A.D. 114. The coincidence is remarkable and constitutes, I consider, good evidence for a brief epiphany of Trajan in the early winter of 113 ». The argument (?) here advanced is that when the emperor visited the temple, the road over which he passed was nothing but mud, and that the city therefore laid down pavement after his departure: but one might prefer to believe that if Trajan actually did visit the sanctuary, then such improvements would have been carried out before his arrival. Since there exists no evidence for a visit by Trajan to the Sanctuary of Apollo, this hypothesis cannot support the editor's dating of the inscription; and since the arguments by which the editor arrived at this date are not conclusive, the date can hardly in turn be considered « good evidence » for an imperial visit. What is certain amidst all these hypotheses is that the inscription is dated by the count of Trajan's

(1) In fact there is no way to determine the length of the pavement referred to in this inscription, and consequently it is impossible to estimate the time necessary for the completion of the work.

(2) Already in 1952 (*Actes II Congrès int. d'épigraphie grecque et lat.*, p. 172; cf. *Archaeology* 5, 1952, p. 156) Mitford had advanced the same theory — with a slightly different date: mentioning « two monumental inscriptions of Trajanic date » at Kourion, he stated that « from one of these monuments it would appear very probable that the emperor visited the island on his voyage from Lycia to Antioch in January of the year 114 A.D. ». However, G. W. Bowersock points out that Malalas p. 270 (Bonn) states that Trajan reached Seleucia in Pieria by December 113 (the times of his departure, in October, and arrival given by Malalas are generally accepted: cf. F. A. LIPPEN, *Trajan's Parthian War*, pp. 29-30).

tribunician power, which also enables us to place the proconsulship of Q. Seppius Celer in 113/4 or 114/5.

The document offers also other features of interest. In lines 7 ff. the word λιθόστρωτος is used as a noun, with δδός understood: « the paved road ». This usage of λιθόστρωτος is not registered by *LSJ*, which cites the word only as an adjective meaning « paved with stones » (attested by a line of Sophocles and two papyri of the third century A.D.) and « 2. esp. of tessellated work... mosaic or tessellated pavement ». In the *Supplement to LSJ*, however, which was published in 1968, there appears the following entry: « 2, add: also λ., ἡ, Kourion no. 109 ». Mitford's work is in fact cited on page x of the *Supplement* among the epigraphical publications, without the author's name and accompanied by the notation « not yet published » (?). But inscription no. 109 in *I. Kourion* nowhere contains the word λιθόστρωτος, nor is it there restored; in this volume λιθόστρωτος occurs in the present text — and here its meaning is clearly not « mosaic or tessellated pavement », as is stated by the *Supplement*, but rather, as we have seen, « paved road ». Thus both the reference and the definition given by the *Supplement* are erroneous.

The inscription furnishes the following information concerning the method of payment here adopted: τῆς δαπάνης γενομένης ἐκ τῶν βουλευτικῶν διαδομάτων καθὼς ἡ Κορινθίων βουλή ἐδογματίσεν. Mitford's comment on this phrase consists of the remark that « διάδομα is a rare noun which has appeared infrequently in the inscriptions, once only in the papyri ». The information contained in this sentence was obtained by consulting the entry s.v. διάδομα in *LSJ*; for that dictionary gives the definition « distribution of money » and cites notably *IG 7.2715.64* (Acræph.). « This text (a decree in honor of the benefactor Epaminondas, in fact *IG VII 2712*) reads as follows in lines 63 ff.: τὸ ἐπὶ πόλεος διάδομα ἐς τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐορτὴν ἔδοκεν πᾶσι τοῖς πολιταῖς καὶ παροῖσι καὶ ἐκτεθμένοις, δίδος κατ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστον κέρηρον σείτον καὶ οἶνον ἡμίτερον (?); from this it is clear that the defi-

(1) Such zeal to include unpublished material is curious on the part of editors who have neglected many hundreds of long-known words; for two series of *addenda* and *corrigenda* by Drew-Bear, see *Glotta* 50, 1972, pp. 61-95 and 182-228.

(2) The text is here given according to the revised edition of J. H. Oliver, *GRBS* 12, 1971, pp. 225-236.

dition in *LSJ* is not correct, for the *διάδομα* here referred to consisted not of money but of grain and wine (cf. also line 80 of the same decree). In *Hellenica* XI-XII, pp. 471 ff., L. Robert replaced the same word in an inscription of Didyma where the correct reading *δοῦσα δὲ τῆς βουλῆς διάδομα καὶ γυναιξὶ καὶ παρθένοις* had been falsely emended in the most recent edition (*I. Didyma* 360) to give *δια(ν)ομά(ς)*; Robert discussed in detail the meaning of the word and each of its attestations, as well as the insufficient entry in *LSJ*.

Knowledge of this discussion by Robert would have been more profitable than the information derived from the dictionary: for the editor was surprised at the fact that approval by the proconsul was required for this disbursement of funds by the local senate, and discusses this procedure at some length: « We have already met in our no. 84 interference on the part of the proconsul in the civic finances of Kourion. Here some fifty years later we have a further instance of this, even more striking: it is a matter, to our thinking, trivial... the cost, it is decreed by the civic council, is to be met by disbursements from the council's own funds. But even this must be scrutinized by the provincial governor. A grateful Kourion, permitted to spend her own money on a minor embellishment of her own temple, credits the whole construction to Caesar. It is but a short step from this to the *curator civitatis*, the *λογιστής*... » But the meaning of *διάδομα* (although Mitford, as we have seen, designated it a rare word, he did not offer a translation) is elucidated by Robert: « l'on voit comme le *διάδομα*, en argent ou en nature, est lié aux banquets ». This brings understanding of the nature of the financial transaction described: the *βουλευτικά διαδόματα* were monies given by benefactors, like those praised in the inscriptions cited above, to be divided among the members of the local senate upon occasions of public rejoicing. Such gifts were often made in the form of a foundation, by which a benefactor would leave a sum of capital from which the interest was to be spent in such periodic distributions⁽¹⁾. That a decision by the senators to forego these distributions and spend the money instead on construction in the Sanctuary of Apollo (thus perhaps altering the terms of the will) should have required ratification by the proconsul is not at all

(1) For examples of such foundations see B. LAUN, *Stiftungen der gr. und röm. Antike* II, pp. 98 ff. (texts) and I, pp. 98 ff. (discussion).

surprising⁽²⁾. The punctuation inserted in line 12 of the inscription after *ἔδογματίσεν* is incorrect: *καθὼς* was meant to be taken equally with *ἔδογματίσεν* and (in line 14) *συνεχώρησεν*, for the two acts are placed by the syntax of the document on the same level: the expense of the pavement was met from the *βουλευτικά διαδόματα* as the senate resolved and the proconsul permitted. Clearly the initiative in this transaction came from the senators themselves, and the « interference on the part of the proconsul in the civic finances » seen by the editor must be reduced to its proper significance⁽²⁾.

Florida State University, Tallahassee Roger S. BAGNALL
Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington Thomas DREW-BEAR

(1) On intervention by Roman authorities in the disposition of revenues derived from such foundations see D. NÖRN, *Imperium und Polis in der hohen Prinzipatszeit* (1966), p. 38.

(2) Mitford similarly exaggerates the extent of Roman control over the city finances in his commentary to no. 107; cf. our remarks in *Phoenix* (n. 2, p. 179).