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THE recent publication of T. B. H. Hildred'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 horosic decree for a Sidonian, the text of which is presented as follows:

[1] — Φιλέτοσειον Ποσειδιανον
[2] μεν Ποσειδιανον, μητέρας Αντακίων α' η'
[3] Εδέσσεις Ναυπάκτων καὶ Μακεδονίας
[4] οἱ ἔγγονοι Ελεαν. Εὐνοῦθι
[5] ἰδίαι — — — — — — Σερόμων,
[6] ἀρχηγῶν τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ
[7] ἐπετήριου καὶ ἐπετῆρίου τῶν
[8] τεσσαρακοταί τῶν λαῶν
[9] [ἐστὶ γάρ] τὸν πόλιταν
[10] τοὺς συνεχείς τών
[12] τῆς τῆς

(1) Memoirs of the American Philological Society, Vol. 45, 1912. We have collaborated on this article in a whole, but primary responsibility for section 1 rests with Bagnall and that for sections 3 and 3 with Drew-Bear.

(2) On the editorial methods and contents of this volume, see our article in Journ. Hell. Stud. 27 (1917), pp. 59-117 and 211-241, and articles by Drew-Bear (B.A.S.P., 6, 1917, pp. 145-163) on the curve tablets, Ch. Haslach (Gnomon Philologica), forthcoming on no. 12, and W. D. Lecon, Système de la lettre, forthcoming on no. 32.
The editor has, as we have seen, suggested that Ptolemy III Euergetes was the sovereign represented by the phrase *Πτολεμαῖος τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ*, with the allegation that this was Euergetes' patronymic. And so it was; but a son of Ptolemy was equally the patronymic of every Ptolemy except the first. And, in fact, the dating formulas call Euergetes *Πτολεμαῖος τιον Πτολεμαίου* and Arsinoe, the Theoi Adelphoi; it is Ptolemy II Philadelphus who is called simply *Πτολεμαῖος τον Πτολεμαίον* (2). This is as true of the overseas possessions of the Ptolemies as of Egypt (2). If Mifrid 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: *Ιαρέας Κασπαρέου της βασίλειας του Πτολεμαίου τον Πτολεμαῖον τον Πτολεμαίον*. The mention of the *Βασίλεια τῆς Βασίλειας* leads the editor to argue that Kaisorion (like Paphos) had an archaic constitution. This may be true, but that the mention of *πόλις* (line 6) and *οικείο* (line 8) reinforce this conclusion (as Mifrid states) is not the case: rather, the former word is (on Mifrid’s restoration) part of the historian’s royal title, while the latter is a typical part of the usual phraseology of such decrees and reflects no special situation.

The considerations begin, on the editor’s restoration, *Ερεμός τον Ἑραλδού...*. Σιδωνία την εν παραλείποντι τάξει τῆς πόλεως [καθορίζεται]. The ethnic Sidonian (3) provides the point of departure for a curious excursion (p. 70): *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 murder of their decisive defeat at Ptolemais in 200 B.C., was famed as a mercenary city. The Sidonians we here encounter was, we may conjecture, not a hellenised native, but a military settler, probably of the second generation *Mifrid cites Launay and Raemaer for his assertions about the garrison; but they deal

---

(1) Cf. Welterbach 111, pp. 33-34.
(2) This point is made by J. and L. Rassow in *Mitth. Internat. Arch.*, Annalen de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves, 15, 1893, pp. 560-561.
only with foreigners in the garrison of Sidon, men who retained their own nationality in the polis itself. There is no evidence for such soldiers becoming citizens of Sidon and using Sidonian as their ethnics. 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, "κάτα is preceded by what would appear to be the bottom of an upright, so spaced as to admit ῥή. This mark, however, may well be casual." There is no reason to accept the claim that this stroke is a casual, and Mathieu himself (p. 76) says, "in line 6 κάτα we have noted as epigraphically a very possible alternative to ῥήτικον. Since κάτα in ῥήτικον; is not particularly cut out of phrase, it is difficult to see why, as the physically preferable reading, it should not be accepted. In this case, the entire titulature of the individual is to be eliminated, since, οὐδεμισθήσομεν; 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 participial οὐδεμισθήσομεν requires ἕπετολε, as is usual in the phraseology of honorific decrees. The most natural place for it would be in the lacuna of lines 7-9, preceding οὐδεμισθήσομεν. Since γεγένηται is, like ἕπετολε, 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 for 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 ἔχομεν 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 B.C., when the city was taken from Demetrius. See E. T. Newman, Times Pastion (1928) and E. Mark, Demetria Politeia (1931), p. 57, n. 32.
(2) Pres. Phil. 15005. Philokles is admittedly an exceptional figure, but several other Sidonians found in various roles in the Ptolemaic Kingdom may be found in F. M. Hudson, Die Juniorgriebe der Kaiserzeit (1902).
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I am unable to parallel epigraphically. On the latter point, it suffices to cite a Thracian inscription of the second century B.C., IG XII 84001, lines 5 ff.: ἔχενες τῷ θεῷ χειροτόνησας τῷ τοῖς σφαγιοῖς παῖς τὴν πόλιν. More curious — and worthy of the editor's doubts — is the placement of the entire ἔχενες phrase, connected very incisively 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 ἐπαίων ἄποικος ἔχενες ἑκατον πολιτείας τῆς τῷ τῷ σφαγίον παῖς τὴν πόλιν
11 (ὑπο:
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 ινος at the end of line 10. The photograph is not, however, sufficiently clear to allow us to judge the substitution of omion 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 1. Kourion 46, an inscription from the second century B.C. erected by [of ἀνδρῶν γεγομένων] in honor of a man and his sons, Mitford states, "the gymnasia 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 1. Kourion to the early part of the reign of Augustus, begins, on the editor's restoration, with the following lines:

[αὐτοῖς Θύημα]
[τῶν ἑμῶν ἄνδρων τῷ ἐπὶ γυμνασίῳ]
[ἐνικηθήσοντος ταύτα τε τὸν ἁρ-
[σόντος ὑμῖν Ἐλλήνων πτahrungen]
The editor comments (p. 149): "It is of interest to find that Kourion at this date was large enough to possess more than one gymnasion. Salamis in middle Hellenistic times had at least three."

A number of problems arise here. As his basis for the statement about Salamis, Milford cites M. L. Strack, Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer (1897) no. 90, who depended in turn on an edition by Waddington (no. 2756) of a dedication to Salamis to a Ptolemaic official apparently enacting from "σὲ γυμνασίον ἑαυτῷ σαλάμαν". The document in question was, however, discovered (with a photograph) in 1966 by J. Poulilou, in an article entitled precisely "Les troïs gymnases de Salamine de Chypre" (5); Poulilou showed (after J. Delorme) that the lines cited must be restored as follows: οἱ [γυμναιον νεια] of [εὲ γυμνασίων Ταρ] — name, patronymic and ethnic (6). Although the correction by Poulilou has been subsequently accepted (7), 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 1977.

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 Milford's own version of the Salamian inscription is to be found: "L. H. Waddington, no. 2756, where, however, we have, on my restoration, οἱ [γυμνανια] of [εὲ γυμνασίων ταρ] — name, patronymic and ethnic; Although Milford does not state this fact here, he had seen the stone himself many years before (8). Since the restoration of Poulilou is certainly correct, it is equally clear that this dotted conclusion must be regarded as imaginary. It is regrettable that a book published in 1971 these [εὲ γυμνασίων ταρ] should be launched on their career without any regard for the correct restoration published five years earlier.

If the Salamian gymnasion cited an existing evidence are fictional, so equally are those of Kourion. In his commentary on the first line of no. 76, Milford continues: "Nevertheless, despite this plurality of gymnasia — for that our inscription moves, whether [γυμνασίων or [γυμναιον or even [γυμνασίων be the correct restoration — the editor of gymnasiae is not by uncommon at Kourion (9). 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 [γυμνασίων at the beginning of the third line is uncertain (10), and with regard to the syntax of the entire phrase the remarks of Poulilou (1) on the inscription of Salamis are worth repeating here: "As demured, the restitution γυμνασίων which it was implied as an adjective with the preceding adjective in a text of a longer than a sentence, with the only exception of the data, e.g. δημοσίου, δήμου, etc."

(1) By that adding [γυμνασίων and [γυμνασίων as possible restorations, Milford tacitly abandons the view expressed in his first edition of this document. Op. Arch. 6, 1936, p. 66: "[γυμνασίων and [γυμνασίων", epigraphically satisfactory alternatives, give no many gymnasia for a city as small as Kourion; (2) Finally it is erroneous. Note that the inscription at Salamis mentions no gymnasium, by [γυμνασίων and [εὲ γυμνασίων.

(3) P. Rosera, BCH 55 (1931) 237; cf. SEG XXX 1087 (the restoration at the beginning of the lines is totally suppressed in SEG); (4) Op. Arch. 1, 1925, p. 54, p. 79.
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On the noun προστάτης, restored in lines 3-4, the editor comments (p. 143): "the title προστάτης τῆς γυμνασίας, although occurring here only for Kourion, abroad is well attested. Cf. for example, α. τοῖς γυμνασίοις τῆς Βραχθίδος (CIG 5882, l. 16)." This same reference to an inscription of a Branchidae is the first entry in LSJ s.v. προστάτης 3, e.g. president or protecting officer (Γ); but one may note that the Corpus of the inscriptions of a Branchidae appeared in 1908 (A. Rehni, Inschriften von Didyma) and that the document cited duly appears therein at no. 84, with commentary on pp. 114-115. Furthermore, the inscription from Kourion under discussion actually does not attest a προστάτης τῆς γυμνασίας at Kourion; what it attests according to the restorations is a προστάτης τῆς ἀπολλούσαν τοῖς δώδεκα γυμνασίοις τῆς Κώνιου (ed. sum.), — if one is willing to accept such an institution and such Greek. Once again there is no cross-reference to no. 46, where the honour is described on the editor's restoration as ἰσομετρὸν γυμνασίου (coll. tōn ἰσομετροῦ, although in a note in no. 184 it is asserted that "ἰσομετρὸν... would appear to be the proper title for the deity or substitute for a gymnasiarch who has defaulded 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 gymnasiarch 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 Milford discusses the role of the gymnasiarch:

(1) For the restoration ἰσομετρὸν γυμνασίου in line 18-19, it would have been useful to refer to the parallel collected by J. and L. Boeckh, Stud. Epigr. 1851, 238 in a previous publication by Jenkins.

(2) The editor refers cited by the editor concern προστάτης of religious organizations, a σύνεδρος at Panopolis in Egypt (SEG IV 190), the Thebais at Athens (CG IV 1736), and a Δήμος of Ionium at Teos (SEG IV 298).

As we have seen, however, the ἰσομετρὸν γυμνασίου survive long past the reign of Philopator at Kourion, in no. 76, and the assertion that they disappear with the gymnasium is thus groundless. But while one will not doubt the connection of the gymnasiarch and the military forces in the Ptolemaic empire, one may be skeptical that the ἰσομετρὸν γυμνασίου were monopolistically military. With or without a gymnasiarch, a Greek city would have a presiding officer of some sort, ephebes and alumnai — for that is what the ἰσομετρὸν γυμνασίου (as at Salamis, where they are distinguished from the ephebes) were (1). As for the idea that the groups elsewhere "influenced on the right" of the council and magistrates, Milford offers 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 cornerstone the erection
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 57 is a block of pitted sandstone with the dedication of a statue of the proconsul Q. Sepanus Celer, Titus Dionysius Candidus, it previously published (9) with Σεπάνους in place of Σεπανοῦς and [9-τ] [?] in place of [9.] Sepanus 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.

The specimen of Sepanus Celer, as read and restored in both publications (9), presents a curious anomaly, for he is said to have been

τραγικὸς ἄγαλμα

Propotion, δικαστὴρ, ἐν Σέρεα.

(9) αὐτός ἐμνεῖς ἃ διδαχῇς

Bustard comments (p. 103): *The words & xiphs=νεών =στόν τέμνεσθαι διανύεσθαι 1 take together, to denote that this man from being merely λατρεὺς προσώπων (μπροστάς, προσώπων) was promoted directly to the proconsulship, omitting the praetorship. But not merely to such aristocracy into praetorship was - in the inscriptions it is regularly reported, as a mark of Imperial favor, in terms much more explicit. Our unusual phrase... seemingly indicates that Sepanus Celer served consecutively both as legate and as proconsul in Cyprus - an arrangement so unusual as to indicate some special circumstances, now lost to us. In the first publication of this text, this special circumstances was explained as follows (p. 70): *We may here note that Marcus freed exercised his right of adlocutio both inter quantum and

inter praetorios; 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 Porcian war and subsequently by the revolt of Avianus Cassivelaunus. But since no. 111 now renders it necessary to reassess 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 Porcian war impending it may well be that Trajan, unwilling to take Cyprus from the Senate by imposing a legatus Augustalis, 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 ἐν τοῖς προσώποις ἐμνεῖς 9 and the elaborations of it.

Furthermore, with regard to this proconsular one reads on page 165 that *not only is he himself otherwise unknown to us, but so also, I believe, is the genus Sepanus; while Cassivelaunus is too uncommon.

This is an astonishing assertion. In the RE is an article s.v. Sepanus (colquittianus Cassivelaunus) by F. Münzer (9), another article by A. Stein on C. Sepanus Daedalus (registered in Pessinthus, N. H. S. 7942, who held the position of head of the idus laps in Egypt from A.D. 14 to 16); and a third on Sepanus I, Ziegler in the obelisk-schen Alpin, one may also consult for this Latin name the fundamentes.

(9) This phrase is registered without comment in Διον. περί γραφεῖσας (Rev. 1902). p. 112, no. 172.

(10) Thus W. Eck, RE Septem, XII, 3, s.v. Sepanus 2, judge that *Er ist jedenfalls aus archäologischen, dass Trajan auch Septem, des nachstehend erzählt versteckte, was Porphyrus registriert haben sollte.

(11) Sepanus is duly registered as proconsul of Cyprus by W. Eck, Septem, but one should notice his亥式 (1971), p. 270, with reference back to Münzer’s first publication of this document and to his rectification of it, together with the then unpublished no. 111, in A.D. 65, 161, p. 104, n. 45, where the name is fairly corrected.

(12) Münzer cites, among other references, Sepanus Lutius, who has an article in RE to himself.

tal work of W. Scholl (9). Sarmot (for which no parallel is cited in I. Kourion) is Oscan as well, in particular Sannite (9).

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

...[Text continues similarly]

Since Trajan held the office of consul only six times, the indication ἄνωτε τῶν in line 4 — emphasized in the text by ἀπὸ — is surprising. In his commentary Milne 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 λάτος (or γαλατός) εἰς. 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 amend to γ (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 edict, princeps, by printing them with dots in the text (9)?

(1) Die Geschichte lebendiger Zeugnisse (Abh. der hebr. Ges. der Wiss. zu Göt-

lingen, phil.-hist. Abt., 15. 2. 1904): here the name is registered as Osema on pp. 124 and 159; cf. the introduction to 2. 1. 3. (2) cited on p. 377, n. 3.

(2) V. Müller cites in Rö. Scoria, mother of Geron's Calpurnius Statius from Lycia, in Sannitica, and 6 Sessii at Beneventum; the same two institutions to Svetate p. 53. 3. 266. / Pouf: register 2. Titus Iustus, a frantic artist in the second half of the first century.

(3) A similar observation may be made with regard to the second numeral in the same sense. In the text, the indication admodum τῶν ἀνωτερῶν is printed as certain, but in the commentary we read: the numeral following the imperial acclamation has been obscured by damage in the stone. But a later horizontal stroke, set above
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The inscription twice mentions the processual whom we have already met, Q. Septimius Celer. According to the editor’s his processualship 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. Septimius 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 processual arrived at least some three months earlier. Even if this terminates 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 (in 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 (9) — because there is no way of determining the location or the extent of the temple — 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 Stibbert himself calls a matter, to our thinking trivial — the
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tributarian power, which also enables us to place the preconsulship of Q. Sципии Цербер in 113 B.C. or 114 B.C.

The document offers also other features of interest. In lines 7 ff. the word ἱδρύματος is used as a noun, with δῆμος understood: the paved road. This usage of ἱδρύματος 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 v esp. of tessellated work... mosaic or tessellated pavement. In the Supplement to LSJ, however, which was published in 1886, there appears the following entry: s 2, add.: also ἱδρύματος. History, 116 B.C. Milford's work, is in fact cited on page 5 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 ἱδρύματος, nor is it there restored; in this volume ἱδρύματος occurs in the present text — and here its meaning is clearly not a mosaic or tessellated pavement, as is stated by the Supplement, but rather, as we have seen, a 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: πῆλος διάμορφης ἐν τῷ πετροδοτικῷ διδασθέντος ἔθνος ὡς Ἑφέσσαι δίω ἰδρυτές. Milford's comment on this phrase consists of the remark that διάδοσις is a rare noun which has appeared indecorously in the inscriptions, once only in the papyri. The information contained in this sentence was obtained by consulting the entry n διάδοσις in LSJ; for that dictionary gives the definition «distribution of money» and cites notably IG 72715.04 (Amenem.), a text (a decree in honor of the benefactor Elephantinos, in fact IG VII 2715) reads as follows in lines 68 ff.: «καθ' ἐν τὸν διάδοσιν ἠλευθερίαν τοῖς πατριάρχαις καὶ συνεργάσισι, δόθηκεν ἡμῖν ἡ αὐτοὶ κυριαρχοῦσιν ᾧ νόμους καὶ ὄρθον ἠμέτακτον;» From this it is clear that the defini-
nition in LSJ is not correct, for the ἄδοξον 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 ἄδοξον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄν ἀνάγεται had been falsely emended in the most recent edition (1. Didyma 360) to give ἄδοξον ἅμα (2); 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 approve by the procurator 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 procurator 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 declared 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 carceres civilis, the ἱμαρτία...But the meaning of ἄδοξον (although Mitford, as we have seen, designated it a rare word, he did not offer a translation) is elucidated by Robert: 'You will remove the ἄδοξον, as argentum et in natura, et ille esse bonus quia. This brings understanding of the nature of the financial transaction described: the ἰδιαίτερα ψηφία 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 rejecting. 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 (c). 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 procurator is not at all surprising (c). The punctuation inserted in line 12 of the inscription after ἰδιαίτερα is incorrect: substantia was meant to be taken equally with ἰδιαίτερα and in line 14 ὀργανοφόρος, 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 ἰδιαίτερα ψηφία as the senate resolved and the procurator permitted (c). Clearly the initiative in this transaction came from the senators themselves, and the interference on the part of the procurator in the civic finances seen by the editor must be reduced to its proper significance (c).
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(c) Mitford similarly exaggerates the extent of Roman control over the city finances in his commentary to no. 167; cf. our remarks in Phoceans (ii. 3, p. 172).