

## SOME OBSERVATIONS ON SEG 24, 1081

BY

AIDA SLABOTZKY

(New York)

"About the middle of February, 1896," in the city of Constantza, "an excavation... on the house-grounds of the lawyer L. Butter, located"<sup>1</sup> on Ceres Street<sup>2</sup> "behind the sanctuary of the church of the Romanian Greek Community" "brought to light" "four four-sided tombstones"<sup>3</sup>, bearing inscriptions. Copies of these, by George J. Kuzos, head of the Greek School at Constantza, were published in printers' characters, along with the measurements of the stones, in 'Αθηνᾶ<sup>4</sup>. To this publication was appended a brief commentary by G. N. Hadzidakis<sup>5</sup>. These finds then appeared in AEM, with further commentary by Gr. G. Tocilescu; they were illustrated to reduced scale by squeeze and facsimile.

The fourth of these stones — Δ' in 'Αθηνᾶ, 94 in AEM — now on exhibit in the main square of Constantza, is the subject of this report. Its dimensions are variously given as 1.28 m. high, 0.53 m. wide<sup>6</sup> and as 1.26 m. high, 0.54 m. thick, 0.71 m. wide<sup>7</sup>.

The stone, qua stone, seems well proportioned and finely worked; far less so the inscription upon it. Perhaps a good craftsman prepared the stone and an inferior or inferiors made the letters.

Crowning the work is a cornice, apparently<sup>8</sup> unadorned but for a plain motif of two concentric rings, visible on the uppermost member at the spectator's right. The other members, in descending order, appear to be a torus, a fillet, an ovolo and a cyma reversa. Immediately below is a band, flat except for a very shallow curve at the top where it meets

<sup>1</sup> Γεώργιος Ι. Κούζος, 'Επιγραφὰὶ ἐκ Κωνσταντίας, 'Αθηνᾶ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας 8, 1896, 345. (Any unacknowledged rendering from a foreign language is mine).

<sup>2</sup> Gr. G. Tocilescu, *Neue Inschriften aus Rumänien: Fortsetzung*, Archaeologisch-Epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn, 19, 1896, 224.

<sup>3</sup> 'Αθηνᾶ, p. 345.

<sup>4</sup> Despite the dates, the 'Αθηνᾶ publication is the earlier, as it is mentioned in AEM, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> So identified, AEM, p. 224. His contribution in 'Αθηνᾶ is signed with the initials Γ.Ν.Χ. (p. 351).

<sup>6</sup> 'Αθηνᾶ, p. 347.

<sup>7</sup> AEM, p. 227. This set of figures also appears in Georgi Mihailov, *Die griechischen Epigramme aus bulgarischen Ländern*, [in Bulgarian] Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia: Faculté historico-philologique, 39 (1942–43), p. 25 No 21. (I have not been able to find any source giving the type of stone or letter-heights.)

<sup>8</sup> As far as I can judge from Fig. I = Fig. 11, p. 189 in Iorgu Stoian, *Contribution à l'étude des tribus de Tomis*, Studii Clasice, 3, 1961 — a photograph which seems intended primarily to show the text, and may give ambiguous impressions of the decoration.

the cornice, bearing the "headline" of the inscription. This same band is continued down the sides and across the lower part of the stone, where it curves at the bottom to meet the base.

The base consists of a cyma reversa filleted at top and bottom, a torus below it, and a rectangular plinth below all. The cyma reversa of the base is wider than that of the cornice; the torus and plinth of the base are narrower than their counterparts in the cornice.

The band joining cornice and base encloses a narrow frame of cyma reversa. Recessed within this are the remaining twenty-four lines of inscription.

Aside from the double roundel, the only ornaments on the stone are two leaves incised near the right margin at ll. 11 and 13 of the framed text. They are approximately heart-shaped and diagonally oriented, with tips pointing downward to the left and stems — that in l. 13 somewhat more vaguely — upward to the right.

The stone has been damaged<sup>9</sup>, but without greatly impairing the legibility of its text. Destruction of the upper right corner has affected only two letters of the heading; and their restoration is virtually sure. At about the middle of the text within the frame, in l. 14, one or two letters are in doubt; but not the most vital.

Fig. I is a copy of a photograph giving a full front view of the stone; Fig. II, a copy of the facsimile from AEM.

The workmanship of the inscription is painful rather than careful. The spacing of ll. 2–25 has some strangeness in the proportion. Until l. 13, the left margin, letter-heights and spaces between lines seem uniform and reasonably adapted to the surface they occupy. From l. 14 on, narrowing of the left margin, greater lateral crowding and decrease in letter-height are observed. From l. 18 on, the congestion seems intensified. In the last three lines, marginal and interlineal space is yet more drastically reduced and ligatures are expanded.

Awkwardness mars the letter-forms as well. Examples are the lobes of *beta* and the obliques of *kappa*, *mu*, four-part *sigma* and *omega*. Letters which should be symmetrical are not; these include *theta*, *omicron* and *phi*. In fact *omicron*, one of the commoner letters, is never twice the same; even when two examples are separated by one *iota*, as in l. 9.

The lettering is sober: this is no "monument... [which] rioted in a profusion of exotic by-forms and a tedious abundance of apices."<sup>10</sup> As at first, the "apices or serifs" are made by "the slight widening, with a twist of the chisel, of the free ends of the letter-strokes."<sup>11</sup> Otherwise, enhancement is confined to the crossbars atop some *alpha* and at the middle of some *upsilon* where the arms meet the stem.

Within each line, letters are generally of uniform height; but exceptions are observable. At l. 22, the third through seventh letters are larger than the rest, possibly due to a flaw in the stone. Throughout the inscription, *theta* and *omicron* appear stunted beside the other letters; being "formed" of "oblique strokes merging to a point", they are "subject

<sup>9</sup> At least some of the damage must have been done after the facsimile had been made (AEM, p. 229 = Fig. II) and before the photograph in Fig. I was taken (refs. in n. prec.).

<sup>10</sup> A. G. Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions* (CUP, 1957), p. 63.

<sup>11</sup> *Ib.*, p. 64.

to... the optical illusion”<sup>12</sup> by which “a line with arrowheads at the ends looks shorter than the same line with the arrowheads reversed.”<sup>13</sup> *Phi* is consistently made larger than the other letters through extension of the vertical stroke beyond both cap and base lines.

But the main features of the inscription are angularity of letter-forms and use of ligatures. Apart from the lobed *beta* and *rho*, every letter which can be made angular is so. *Theta* is everywhere rhomboid; as is *omicron*, save for the last one in l. 15, which is admittedly well-rounded.<sup>14</sup> *Sigma* has three strokes (⌒) in every example<sup>15</sup> until l. 18, where four-branched *sigma* (Σ) replaces it and is used exclusively to the end of the text.<sup>16</sup> *Omega* is always four-branched, like an inverted *mu*.

*Mu* and *omega* have their outer strokes vertical, not diagonal, perhaps to facilitate ligature. For all the numerous ligatures but one — at the end of l. 17 — are made by fusing two adjacent verticals. Every suitable letter is used for ligature of this kind; but not in every possible case.<sup>17</sup>

Ligatures span word-limits in sixteen out of these forty-eight examples.<sup>18</sup> However, it seems that word-division is sometimes observed on the stone. In l. 1, a larger space than usual, and a mark, separate *παροδεῖτα* and *καί*. In l. 3 there is a space between *πόθεν* and *ἥδε*; l. 5 has a large space and mark after *τούμόν*; l. 7, a large space and mark after *Ἀθηναίαις*. In l. 9 a mark follows *οὐνομα*. The leaves in ll. 11 and 13 mark word ends; that in l. 11, also, the end of a *colon*. Even where the text is more crowded, at l. 15 there is a mark after *ἔλβιος*; and at l. 17, a larger space and a mark after *μετέσχον* denote what could be called the equivalent of a paragraph. Another large space and mark occur at l. 19 after *παρέσχον*. In l. 21, there is definitely a space following *σαφῶς*. The mark in l. 21 after *ἐ/νενκαμεν* could be a punctuation — in which case *ἔγνω σαφῶς* is set off on both sides — or it could be a letter, forming *ἐ/νενκαμένη*.

<sup>12</sup> Charles R. Anderson, *Lettering* (New York, 1969), p. 107.

<sup>13</sup> Philip Morrison, *Books*, Scientific American, 227, no. 2 (Aug., 1972), 120.

<sup>14</sup> On the use in one inscription of different forms for the same letter, cf. Salomon Reinach, *Traité d'Épigraphie grecque* (Paris, 1885), p. 195 w. n. 1 ad loc., and p. 210 w. n. 3 ad loc. Cf. IBM 175 (Tomi).

<sup>15</sup> That in l. 1 is attested by the vertical stroke remaining on the stone, and by the facsimile (Fig. II), which shows a better state of preservation.

<sup>16</sup> Variants of *sigma* seem the most numerous among the examples ap. Reinach (n. 14). On the stone here considered, the change is uneconomical: where space is at a premium, use of three-part *sigma* would have allowed more ligatures — *ως*, l. 18; *αφορῶσα*, l. 19; *σαφῶς*, l. 21; *Τομιτης*, l. 23; *φυλης*, l. 24 — and augmentation of two existing ones — N + Ω to N + Ω + Σ for the fifth lig. in l. 21 and N + Η to N + Η + Σ for the first in l. 23. But cf. n. foll.

<sup>17</sup> E. g., H and K, l. 2; N and E, l. 4;... even with crowding: N and B, l. 14; N, mark, and E, l. 19; N and E, l. 20, fin.

<sup>18</sup> Viz.: *πρὶν Ἑλλάς*, l. 6; *ἐσεῖδον ἐγώ, ἐγώ γαῖαν γαῖαν πᾶσαν*, l. 10; *ἦν γὰρ* (three letters), l. 12; *πρὶν ἦν* (three letters), *ἐν Μούσαις, ἐφύην σοφίης* (three letters), l. 16; *γυνή γυνήξ* (three letters), l. 18; *δὴ κλεινήρη, κλεινήρη κάματον, κάματον πολὺν*, l. 20; *ἐ/νενκαμένη ἔγνω*, l. 21; *εὐ/σεβίαν εἰσιν*, l. 22; *τῇ αὐτοῦ*, l. 23; *εὐχαριστῶν μνείας* (five letters), l. 25. Two of these are disputable: the second in l. 20 may be within a word, the compound *κλεινήρη κάματον* — v. inf. p. 127; and the *eta* in the transcription for l. 21 may not exist at all, leaving no ligature at this place — v. p. 127 and 128.

Syllabic division at line-ends appears accurate throughout.

Having detailed the outward and visible signs on the stone, the observer must examine the evidence of things not seen.

L. 1 reads **ΧΑΙΠΕ ΠΑΡΟΔΕΙΤΑ-ΚΑΙ** [... A vertical stroke follows **καί**; its upper part is lost (Fig. I). But the facsimile from AEM has... **ΚΑΙΛΥ** (Fig. II). "Not infrequently ... [one studying] a document long since known will make the observation that some letters on the edges, seen by an earlier scholar, have now disappeared."<sup>19</sup> L. 1 is an exchange of courtesies: the deceased began, **ΧΑΙΠΕ, ΠΑΡΟΔΕΙΤΑ**; the wayfarer correctly answered, **ΚΑΙ** **ΖΥ**.<sup>20</sup>

Greetings from the dead,<sup>21</sup> and to them,<sup>22</sup> are each found in early grave-inscriptions and become familiar thereafter.<sup>23</sup> But the interlocation is rarer; and its treatment here is unusual: most texts have it at or near the end;<sup>24</sup> generally the traveler speaks

<sup>19</sup> Woodhead, p. 70.

<sup>20</sup> L. Robert, *Hellenica* 4, 1948, p. 48, cont. of n. 8 ad p. 47, reads this line: **Χαῖρε, παροδεῖτα, καὶ σὺ**. Mihailov, GEB, p. 25 No 21, has the same punctuation. It could give the meaning, 'Hail, voyager, even unto thee'; or perhaps 'Greetings... to you also', as one of those who pass in never-ending line. Kuzos, p. 347, has **Χαῖρε παροδεῖτα — Καὶ σὺ/ἔστῃς** ...: '...you, too, have halted...' or '... are standing...'. However, Tocilescu, p. 228, puts a stop (·) after **παροδεῖτα**. Mihailov has this punctuation in his index of first lines to GEB, *Annuaire de l'Univ. de Sofia: Faculté historique-philologique*, 40 1943–44, p. 40. So does Stoian — both in *Tomitana: contribuții epigrafice la istoria cetății Tomis*, (Bucharest, 1962), p. 65, and in *StCl*, 3 1961, p. 188. So, too, SEG, 24 1969, p. 301 No 1081. Stoian's Romanian translation, *Tomitana*, p. 65 also gives the dialogue.

<sup>21</sup> E. g., IG 12.9, 285 (Eretria, VIa); GVI 1209 (Aegina, VI/V); IG 2/3<sup>2</sup>, 11780 (Thoricus, init. IV); IG 2/3<sup>2</sup>, 10435 (Attica, init. IV). All four are taken as "clearly, more or less unskilful copies of some noble original, on a man buried in a foreign land," by H. T. Wade-Gery in "The Inscriptions on Stone", ch. 7 of Humfry Payne et al., *Perachora*, I (OUP, 1940), p. 266. The stone here discussed was also for one "buried in a foreign land" (ll. 5–6); having been well-read (ll. 16–17) and well-traveled (ll. 9–10), the deceased could have known of this filiation if such knowledge survived to later antiquity.

<sup>22</sup> Although this was formerly disputed, cf. Günther Klaffenbach, *Griechische Epigraphik*, 2 Aufl. (Göttingen, 1966), p. 58, and Woodhead, p. 44. But GVI 1384 (Teithronium, Phocis) is dated VI/V. Cf. Werner Peek, *Griechische Grabgedichte*, Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft bei der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin: Schriften und Quellen der alten Welt, 7 1960, *Einführung*, p. 14.

<sup>23</sup> For another use of the elements **χαῖρε** and **καὶ σὺ**, cf. Otto Jahn, *Archäologische Beiträge* (Berlin, 1847), p. 148 f., n. 129, also, Louis Jalabert & René Mouterde, S. J., *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* (Paris, 1929), No 387; 576; 874; 875; 1010; 1069; 1070, 15 and 31 w. refs. p. 574 and comm. p. 577 of vol. 3<sup>2</sup>; and No 2022.

<sup>24</sup> The examples I have been able to find may be sorted as follows. Ad init.: IG 14, 319 (Thermae Himeratae, Sicily); GVI 936 (Cos, I/II), 1851 (Cyzicus, II/I), 1854 1855 (similar, both Mysia, resp. I/II and IIp.). Ad fin., preceded only by allocution to deceased; CIG 1982 (Thessalonica); IG 4, 651 (Argos); IG 5.1, 1278 (Hippola v. Messa, **καὶ σὺ** by diff. hand); IG 12.1, 1019 (Carpauthus); IG 12.3 suppl., 1285 (Nisyros); IG 14, 60 (Syracuse, damaged); IPE 1<sup>2</sup>, 225 (Olbia, aet. rec.); AEM 7, 1883, p. 133 No 64 (Rhodes, damaged — for club-members); AEM 10 1886, p. 221 No 32 (Rhodes); BCH 10 1886, p. 453 No 1 (Smyrna). Ad fin., preceded by longer text: CIG 1956 (Macedonia), 1987 (Thessalonica), 1988b (ib.), 3278 (Smyrna); IG 9.2, 953 (Larisa); IG 14, 2006 (Rome); AEM 6 1882, p. 5 No 8 (= *Tomitana*, p. 208 No 13 attrib. to Tomi); AEM 6, p. 28 No 57 (Tomi, rest. but sure); AEM 8 1884, p. 222, No 52 (Heraclea Perinthos); GVI 812 (Cericus, in. IIp.), 1683 (Cyzicus, ex. II); 1853 (Carnutum, med. Ip.), 1860 (Paros, Ip., in the poem), 1866 (Rome, IIIp., in the poem); Rob., *Glad.*, 12 (Thessalonica, allocution to deceased in diff. lettering). Other cases: AEM 9 1885, p. 117 No 71 (Ancyra) has **Χαῖρεται** (= **Χαῖρεται**?), 1.2, and **καὶ / σὺ**, 11. 7–8, fin.; the exchange would then frame the interjacent text. In GVI 1852 (Lappa, Crete, aet. Rom.), the exchange of greetings is the whole inscription.

first<sup>25</sup>. Χαῖρε παροδ(ε)ῖτα alone is normally put in conclusion,<sup>26</sup> and in quite prosaic epitaphs.<sup>27</sup> The wording here may be an intended play against expected forms.<sup>28</sup>

The deceased goes on to tell her name, Epiphania (ll. 8–9), and something of her life. She had been daughter and wife to shipmasters (ll. 12–13), οὗς ἐθέμην, she says, ΠΑΛΑΜΕΣΙΝ Αἰ... ΝΑΙΕ ὑπὸ τὸν βω θανόντας (ll. 13–15). Kuzos has παλάμεσιν αἰμαῖς<sup>29</sup>; Tocilescu prints the adjective as αἰ[μ]αῖς<sup>30</sup>, rendering “ihren Vater und ihren Gatten ... habe sie mit eigenen Händen bestattet.”<sup>31</sup> Stoian, contra, says “on the stone, clearly ἀγναῖς...”;<sup>32</sup> and translates ‘... laid them to rest with hands unsullied.’<sup>33</sup> Th. Sauciuc-Săveanu, evaluating the earlier studies, says categorically: “a Greek word in the form αἰμαῖς does not exist in the

<sup>25</sup> Stranger clearly speaks first: CIG 1956, 1982, 1987, 1988b; IG 4, 651; IG 5.1, 1278; IG 9.2, 953; IG 12.3 suppl., 1285; IG 14, 60 and 319; IPE 1<sup>2</sup>, 225; AEM 6, p. 5 No 8; AEM 7, p. 133 No 64; BCH 10, p. 453 No 1; GVI 936, 1683, 1851, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1860, 1866; *Glad.* 12. At CIG 3278, Boeckh says stranger speaks first; on this analogy, other examples are IG 14, 2006; AEM 8, p. 222 No 52; and GVI 812. Possibly begun by stranger, but w. name of deceased in nominative, are IG 12.1, 1019; and AEM 10, p. 221 No 32. Deceased speaks first: AEM 6, p. 28 No 57; and 9, p. 117 No 71.

<sup>26</sup> Ad init.: CIG 4068 (Ancyra); IG 12.7, 118 (Arcesine); IG 14, 1732 (Rome); GEB Add. — Ann. de l'Univ. de Sofia: Fac. de Lettres, 48 (1952/53) — 144a (Amphipolis). Framing rest of text: SEG 24, 643 (Traianopolis, IIP). Ad fin.: CIG 2135 (Aegean, wds. reversed, π. χ.), 4055 (Ancyra), 4069 (ib.); IG 5.1, 769 (Sparta); IG 9.2, 318 (Tricca); IG 12.7, 315 — in two pts.; χ. π. at end of each, 347 — reversed, 358, 361 — reversed, 368, 377 (all Minoa); IG 12.7, 479 (Aegiale, inf. aet.); IG 14, 494 (Catania), 1431 (Rome); IBM 177 (Tomi); IGB 1, 135 (Odessus), 346 (Mesembria); IGB 2, 494 (nr. Mezdra), 688 (nr. Nicopolis ad Istrum), 744 (Abritus), 828 (nr. Marcianopolis); MAMA 5, 28 (Dorylaeum); AEM 6, 1882, p. 22 No 43 (Tomi); AEM 7, 1883, p. 183 No 50 (Sivrihissar, Asia Minor); AEM 8, 1884, p. 15 No 43 (nr. Tomi), p. 23 f. No 62 (nr. Tomi), p. 222 No 55 (Heraclea Perinthos); AEM 9, 1885, p. 19 No 31 (Spalato); AEM 11, 1887, p. 59 No 114 (Tomi), p. 59 No 115 (ib.), p. 62 No 125 (nr. Tomi); AEM 17, 1894, p. 49f. No 3 (Serdica), p. 55 No 3 (Bergulae), p. 97 No 32 (Tomi); AEM 18, 1895, p. 113 No 22 (nr. Tatar-Pazardžik, Bulg.); AEM 19, 1896, p. 98 No 46 (Tomi), p. 100 f. No 52 (ib.), p. 109 f. No 65 (Callatis, wds. reversed); Dacia, NS 7, 1963, p. 559 f. No 2 (Tomi), p. 564 f. No 4 (ib.); SBAM 1, 1875 p. 93 No 26 (Tomi, bilingual; damaged but rest. likely); SEG 12, 322 (Beroea, Maced.), 328 (ib.); SEG 24, 774 (Constantinople), 952 (nr. Vraca, ex. IIP.); SEG 25, 761 (Tomi, II/III), 763 (ib.), 808 (Moesia); Kal. 307 (nr. Küstendil); GEB 29 (Tomi); GVI 206 (Blaunda, Lydia, II/III), 248 (Thasos, IIP.), 386 (Serdica, II/III), 410 (Minoa, II/III), 470 (Marcianopolis, II/III), 1026 (Tomi, IIP.), 1101 (Arcesine, II/III), 1828 (Sparta, II/III, wds. reversed); *Glad.* 29 (Bergulae), 45 (Tomi), 56 (Larisa), 81 (Nicaea), 285 (Tenedos? = IG 12.2, 614, w. attrib. sure and inscr. held Christian). I have not noted different spelling e.g., χῆρε or παροδῖτα.

<sup>27</sup> Prosaic: CIG 2135, 4055, 4068, 4069; IG 5.1, 769 (damaged); IG 9.2, 318; IG 12.7, 347, 358 (damaged), 361, 368, 377, 479; IG 14, 494, 1431, 1732; IBM, 177; IGB 1, 135; IGB 2, 494, 688, 744, 828 (damaged); AEM 6, p. 22 No 43; AEM 7, p. 183 No 50; AEM 8, p. 15 No 43, p. 23 f. No 62, p. 222 No 55; AEM 9, p. 19 No 31; AEM 11, p. 59 No 114, ib. 115, p. 62 No 125; AEM 17, p. 49f. No 3, p. 55 No 3, p. 97 No 32; AEM 18, p. 113 No 22; AEM 19, p. 98 No 46, p. 100 f. No 52, p. 109 f. No 65; Dacia NS 7, p. 559 f. No 2, p. 564 f. No 4; SBAM 1, p. 93 No 26; SEG 12, 322, 328; SEG 24, 774, 952; Kal. 307; *Glad.* 45. Poetic, or partly so: IG 12.7, 118, 315; IGB 1, 346; MAMA 5, 28; SEG 24, 643; SEG 25, 761, 763, 808; GEB 29; ib. Add., 144a; GVI 206, 248, 386, 410, 470, 1026, 1101, 1828; *Glad.* 29, 56, 81, 285.

<sup>28</sup> I owe this idea to Professor Howard N. Porter, who has made it yield richly in literary studies. If its application here is inappropriate, the fault is entirely mine.

<sup>29</sup> Ἀθηνᾶ, p. 347.

<sup>30</sup> AEM 19, p. 228.

<sup>31</sup> *Ib.*, p. 229; line-refs. there are to printed text, p. prec., not to ll. on stone.

<sup>32</sup> *Tomitana*, p. 65, n. 5; *St. Cl.* 3, p. 188, n. 4.

<sup>33</sup> *Tomitana*, p. 65.

Greek language.”<sup>34</sup> For ἀγναῖς, he reads αἰναῖς; as the “single horizontal stroke” which “makes the distinction, graphically, between ἀγνός and αἰνός . . . does not appear on the stone.”<sup>35</sup>

Sauciuc-Săveanu takes παλαμῆσιν αἰναῖς with θανόντας, although the first two words are “slightly dislocated and separated” from the participle “by the prepositional phrase ὑπὸ τὸν βω, which should find its place immediately after the verb ἐθέμην.”<sup>36</sup> For him, παλαμῆσιν αἰναῖς is an adverbial phrase of manner indicating “the cause of death of the two shipmasters”;<sup>37</sup> he would render ‘. . . whom I laid in the tomb when they had been done to death by murderous hands [sc., the hands of pirates]’. He is the more certain that this is the proper collocation because the word παλάμη is “the symbol of force and violence.”<sup>38</sup>

It is true that παλάμη usually has a derived meaning;<sup>39</sup> and often appears in contexts of force and violence, like the English ‘at the hands of’.<sup>40</sup> It is true that inscriptions give this sense.<sup>41</sup> But the force can be much attenuated;<sup>42</sup> and from Homer on, παλάμη has many other uses.

It first occurs in the *Il.* with connotations which are really anti-violent: Achilles swears by the staff: νῦν αὐτέ μιν υἷες Ἀχαιῶν / ἐν παλάμῃς φορέουσι δικασπόλοι, οἳ τε θέμιστας / πρὸς Διὸς εἰρύαται (1.237–9). In other examples, it refers to ordaining<sup>43</sup> and maintaining<sup>44</sup> a state. It is put with good against evil, once as ‘occasion’<sup>45</sup> once as ‘accomplishment’.<sup>46</sup> Παλάμη the attribute of deity stands for grace,<sup>47</sup> justice,<sup>48</sup> or creative power;<sup>49</sup> παλάμη, of mortals, can mean ‘receptor’: Empedocles can write . . . παλάμαι κατὰ γυῖα κέχυνται.<sup>50</sup> The word also represents powers of the mind,

<sup>34</sup> *Pe marginea unei inscripții funerare din Tomis*, Studii și cercetări de istorie veche, 15 (1964), p. 137. Germ. res. of this article in Bibliotheca Classica Orientalis, 10. Jahrgang (1965), Heft 2, p. 76f.

<sup>35</sup> SCIV, p. 138.

<sup>36</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>37</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>38</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>39</sup> I have found at most five examples of literal use: Arist. *Pr.* 966 b 14, Opp. *Cyn.* 2.524, *Hal.* 4.489–90; perh. too *Hal.* 3.154 and GVI 1678 (Rome, II/III).

<sup>40</sup> Word for word: *Il.* 3.126–8, 5.557–8, 7.104–5, 24.737–8; Pi. *N.* 10.65; A. *Su.* 865 (if accepted); E. *An.* 1027; AG 6.323.2 (Leon.), 7.147.10 (Arch.), 9.385.12 (Steph. Gram.), 9.397.5 (Pall.); perh. Alc. Z57 (*PLF*) also belongs here. Other examples: *Il.* 3.338, 3.367–8, 5.594, 8.110–11, 15.676–8, 16.74–5, 16.139–42, 21.468–9; *Od.* 17.231–2; E. *Or.* 819–22; S. *Ph.* 177, w. Lachmann’s reading, cf. *ib.* 1206; A.R. 3.283–4 (of Eros), 4.465; AG 6.97.5–6 (Antiphil.), 6.122.3–4 (Nic.), 9.157.3 (Anon., of Eros); Opp. *Cyn.* 2.66, 2. 475–6, 4.23–4, 4.36 (of a beast), 4.191–2, 4.416–21 (of a beast, twice); *Hal.* 5.254–6 (echo of *Il.* 16. 139–42?). Against critical opinion, another instance might be A. *Pr.* 165. Where violence threatens: *Od.* 17.4 and — for the reader 19.577 and 21.75; Stesich. 40 (PMG); A.R. 1.1254, 3.1251, 4.1055; Opp. *Cyn.* 1.99–100, 4.288–9 and 366.

<sup>41</sup> Surely IG 9.1<sup>2</sup>, 313 (Thyrrhæum, Ila.) and IG 12.7, 115 (Arcesine, II/I). Probably GVI 983 (Hierapolis, I/II). Possibly *Glad.* 239 (Smyrna).

<sup>42</sup> *Od.* 1.104 and 2.10; Simonides 76 (PMG); AG 7.268.1–3 (Plato); *Cyn.* 2.347 and 357.

<sup>43</sup> Pi. *N.* 10.5.

<sup>44</sup> AG 7.241.10 (Antip. Sid.); *Cyn.* 1.10–11.

<sup>45</sup> Thgn. 623–4.

<sup>46</sup> Id. 1027–28.

<sup>47</sup> Pi. *O.* 10.21, *P.* 1.48; perh. “Simonides” ap. DL 4.45.

<sup>48</sup> Pi. *P.* 2.40.

<sup>49</sup> Empedocles, DK 31B75 and 31B95.

<sup>50</sup> DK 31B2; same meaning at 31B3.

admirable<sup>51</sup> or not<sup>52</sup>; and sometimes their result: a 'maneuver' planned to save one's country,<sup>53</sup> or one's skin.<sup>54</sup> More literally, it denotes the hand performing religious acts.<sup>55</sup> It might express elemental 'tenacity'<sup>56</sup> or just plain 'gumption'<sup>57</sup>; and it undoubtedly manifests 'skill'.<sup>58</sup>

Some of these literary meanings are found on stone. The hand of deity appears<sup>59</sup>; so too may that of the believer.<sup>60</sup> Skill is commemorated.<sup>61</sup> Zeno of Aphrodisias, the sculptor, affirms... καὶ τεύξας Ζήνωνι νέω προτεθνηκότι παιδί / τύμβον, καὶ στήλην καὶ εἰκόνας αὐτὸς ἐγλύψα / ταῖσιν ἐμαῖς παλάμαισι, τεχνασσάμενος κλυτὸν ἔργον.<sup>62</sup> And others use παλάμη of giving the last comforts. A husband says... ἐνθάδε κεῖμαι / ἐν χρηστῆς ἀλόχου πνεῦμα λιπὼν παλάμαις;<sup>63</sup> a master<sup>64</sup> declares... ὑπὸ θρεπτοῦ / ... εὐσεβέως θάπτομαι ἐν παλάμαις;<sup>65</sup> a tomb of children has... ἀρ]σενίηι θάψε πατήρ παλάμη.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Pi. O. 13. 52.

<sup>52</sup> Id. P. 2.75.

<sup>53</sup> Hdt. 8.19.

<sup>54</sup> Ar. V. 644–5 (antiphrastic echo of Thgn. 623–4?).

<sup>55</sup> AG 7.711.3–4 (Antip. Sid.), 9.602.1–2 (Even.).

<sup>56</sup> S. Ph. 177 w. mss. reading.

<sup>57</sup> AG 7.736.5–6 (Leon.); cf. n. on literal meaning in Gow & Page (CUP, 1965), II, 344.

<sup>58</sup> Il. 15.410–12, 18.599–601; Od. 5.233–4; H. Merc. 108–10; Hes. Sc. 216–20, 319–20; Th. 578–80, 864–6 (of smelting, cf. comm. of M. L. West, OUP, 1966, pp. 394–5); Ibyc. 40 (PML); Alc. L 1 (PLF); Pindar so uses it of himself O. 9.25–6 and P. 1.44–5 and of others, human P. 4.202, or divine Pae. 8.65–6 (Snell); A.R. 4.970–72; AG 7.168.3 (Antip. Thess.), 9.242.3–4 (Antiphil.), 9.510 (Anon.); Cyn. 2.536–9, 4.103–4; Hal. 3.76–7, 4.593–5, 614–5, 633–4, 658–60.

<sup>59</sup> IG 14, 2012 A, ll. 27–8 and C, epigr. a, ll. 9–10 (Rome, 94 A.D. or later); EG 818, ll. 12–14 (Paros, aet. val. rec.); GVI 1678, ll. 7–8 (Rome, II/III); GVI 1989, l. 18 (Panticapaeum, II/I). Line-refs. here and hereinafter are to printed copy, unless noted "on stone",

<sup>60</sup> IG 9.2, 615 (Larisa, badly damaged).

<sup>61</sup> EG 828, ll. 7–8 (Mytilene, IIP. latest); EG 907 (Sinope, IV fere saec.); GVI 1544, l. 3 (Egypt, I/II); Jahresh. 30, 1937 Beibl., p. 204f. No 10 (Ephesus, IIP.), w. comm.; perh. also *Didyma* 118 (IIa., damaged), so interp. in comm., p. 123.

<sup>62</sup> CIG 6233, ll. 4–6 (Rome = GVI 1056, dated IIP.); GVI prints... καὶ στ. [τάς] / εἰς.... Other cases of παλάμη as skill memorializing the dead: GVI 655, ll. 9–10 (Trachonitis, II/III); and 1428 (Palaia Isaura, II/III).

<sup>63</sup> IG 12.8, 93, ll. 1–2 (Imbros, IIP.). Another example of παλάμη for care of the dying may be IG 5.2, 413, l. 7 (Thelphusa, damaged.).

<sup>64</sup> In either sense, or perh. a guardian. Cf., e.g., Mau, *Alumnus*, *θρεπτός*, RE I, 1894, col. 1706; A. Cameron, *Θρεπτός and Related Terms in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor*, in *Anatolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, ed. W. M. Calder and J. Keil (Manchester University Press, 1939), pp. 27–62; Teresa Giulia Nani, *Θρεπτοί*, *Epigraphica*, 5–6, 1943–44, pp. 45–84; Iorgu Stoian, *Unele aspecte, pină acum necunoscută, ale sclavajului la Tomis în lumina unei inscripții inedite*, (Lat. inscr. is IVP.; art. has res. in Russian and French), St. Cl., 2, 1960, pp. 291–302.

<sup>65</sup> GVI 476, ll. 1–2 (Hadrianutherae, Ip.).

<sup>66</sup> IG 5.2, 498, ll. 1–2 (vic. Megalopolis, IIP. v. post.). Another sure example of παλάμη for proper burial is EG 409, ll. 1–2 (Arycanda, I/II). The following are much damaged and restored. With wd. παλάμη incompletely preserved: IG 2/3<sup>a</sup>, 10900 (Athens, II/III); GVI 1027, l. 4 (Chersonesus, IIP.); GVI 1440, ll. 1–2 (Plataea, II/III). Wd. clear but context doubtful: EG 291 (Tralles), quoted by Mihailov in this sense re Epiphania's stone GEB 21–I, 26, n. ad l. 9; *Glad.* 239 (Smyrna), which may belong here and not in n. 44 supr. if σύνζυγος, l. 4 on stone, means 'wife'; cf. comm., p. 208. Also GVI 2077, w. comm. p. 695 (Egypt, IIP.).

It may, then, be well to re-examine each of the words conjectured here. Admittedly, αἰνός means 'terrible'. But, even to denote harm,<sup>67</sup> its range of applications is wide, in both active and passive: two texts have the superlative degree, one for the murderer of a holy snake,<sup>68</sup> one for a mother who lost her son.<sup>69</sup> Αἰνός marks the sufferer's condition<sup>70</sup> — ἄχος,<sup>71</sup> δέος,<sup>72</sup> ἔλεος,<sup>73</sup> πένθος,<sup>74</sup> φόβος,<sup>75</sup> τρόμος<sup>76</sup> — or affliction — κάματος,<sup>77</sup> νόσος,<sup>78</sup> οἰζύς,<sup>79</sup> στεινός.<sup>80</sup> Among the sources of evil, it can refer to time,<sup>81</sup> place,<sup>82</sup> or event;<sup>83</sup> and to groups or individuals, monster,<sup>84</sup> animal,<sup>85</sup> human,<sup>86</sup> or divine.<sup>87</sup> It characterizes passion — κότος,<sup>88</sup> μῆνις,<sup>89</sup> ὕβρις,<sup>90</sup> φθόνος,<sup>91</sup> ῥόλος — <sup>92</sup> strife — <sup>93</sup> δῆϊότης,<sup>94</sup> ἔρις,<sup>95</sup> νεῖκος,<sup>96</sup> πόλεμος,<sup>97</sup> φύλοπις,<sup>98</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Which it does not always do. E. g.: in *H. Merc.* 226 (pos. & comp.) it seems to mean only 'strange'; in *Od.* 19.568, *Hes. Sc.* 226—7 and *A.R.* 3.1169, the primary emphasis is on helpfulness, though with evil for the evil; in *A.R.* 4.647—8 and 1618—19, the agencies are wholly beneficial.

<sup>68</sup> *GVI* 1313, l. 5 (Memphis, IIa.).

<sup>69</sup> *Ib.* 1923, l. 16 (Cyzicus, Ip.).

<sup>70</sup> Various adv. acc.: *Il.*, 1.414, 13.52 (sup.), 22.431; *Od.* 22.447; *A.R.* 3.806; *AG* 9.57.4 (Pamphil.); *Hal.* 5.311, 5.552 (sup.); *GVI* 756, l. 5 (Miletus, ex. II, damaged); possible echoes of *Il.*, 22.431 are *GEB* 159, l. 3 (Thasos, very damaged) and *GVI* 878, l. 9 (Lyttos Iip., damaged). Absolutely: *Il.* 5.886 and *Od.* 10.219 of entities that may be 'frightening', but are powerless to harm.

<sup>71</sup> *Il.* 4.169; 8.124, 147, 316; 15.208; 16.52, 55, 508; 17.83; 19.307; 22.43. *Od.* 16.87; 18.274. *H. Cer.* 90 (comp.). *H. Ven.* 198—9. *S. Aj.* 706. *A.R.* 4.866. *IPE* 2.86, l. 10 (nr. Panti-capaeum, Ip. earliest).

<sup>72</sup> *A. R.* 2.577 (sup.).

<sup>73</sup> *Ib.* 3.462 (sup.).

<sup>74</sup> *Ib.* 3.675.

<sup>75</sup> *Pi. P.* 5.60.

<sup>76</sup> *Il.* 7.215, 11.117, 20.44.

<sup>77</sup> *Il.* 10.312, 399; *Od.* 5.457.

<sup>78</sup> *GVI* 1166, l. 13 (Smyrna, IIip.); cf. *Hes. fr.* 29.1 Rzach.

<sup>79</sup> *Od.* 15.342.

<sup>80</sup> *Il.* 8.476 (sup.).

<sup>81</sup> *Hes. Op.* 802; *H. Cer.* 305 (sup.); *A.R.* 1070—71 (sup.).

<sup>82</sup> *Pi. P.* 1.15.

<sup>83</sup> *Il.* 18.465; *Od.* 4.441 (sup.), 12.275 (sup.); *A.R.* 4.1261 (sup.); *Cyn.* 1.257; *Hal.* 1.553 (sup., bis).

<sup>84</sup> *Call. Ap.* 100—1, *Dian.* 51; *Theoc.* 24.13; *A.R.* 1.996, 2.405.

<sup>85</sup> *Hes. fr.* 14.6 Rz.; *Theoc.* 25.205, 252; *Cyn.* 3.257, 4.37 and 211.

<sup>86</sup> *Od.* 11.427 (comp.); *S. OC* 212; *Hal.* 2.670—1 (comp.); *GVI* 1167, l. 12 (Antinoe, IIip.).

<sup>87</sup> *Il.* 1.552, 4.25, 8.423, 8.462, 14.330, 16.440, 18.361 (all sup.); *Hes. Op.* 465 (v. l. for ἀγῆ), *Sc.* 264; *Hal.* 4.407 (adv. acc.); *GVI* 1572, l. 1 (Demetrias, Thess., in. IIIa.).

<sup>88</sup> *Il.* 8.449, 16.449.

<sup>89</sup> *H. Cer.* 350, 410.

<sup>90</sup> *Pi. P.* 11.55.

<sup>91</sup> *GVI* 1114, l. 4 (Anazarbus, IIip., epit. of Oppian).

<sup>92</sup> *Il.* 22.94; *H. Cer.* 354; *Batr.* 102; *A.R.* 1.614.

<sup>93</sup> Adv. acc.: *Od.* 16.255.

<sup>94</sup> *Il.* 3.20; 5.409; 7.40, 51, 119, 174; 13.207, 603; 15.512; 22.64. *Od.* 11.516; 12.257; 22.229. *Hes. Th.* 662, 852.

<sup>95</sup> *Il.* 14.389 (sup.).

<sup>96</sup> *GEB* 88a, l. 11 (Augusta Traiana, rest.) cf. ed. of *SEG* 19, 456, dated c. med. Iip., w. full rests. and later refs., but no mention of Mihailov.

<sup>97</sup> *Od.* 8.519 (sup.).

<sup>98</sup> *Il.* 4.15, 65, 82; 5.379, 496; 6.1, 105; 11.213; 16.256, 677; 18.171. *Od.* 24.475. *H. Cer.* 266. *Hes. Op.* 161, *Sc.* 200. *GVI* 835, l. 1 (Ptolemais, Cyrenaica, IIip.) seems echo of *Op.* 161.



— and treachery.<sup>99</sup> It is used of means to ill wrought by god,<sup>100</sup> by nature,<sup>101</sup> and by man.<sup>102</sup>

However, I have not found παλάμη with αἰνός. As 'terrible' or 'death-dealing hand', παλάμη takes the adjectives ἀνδροφόνος,<sup>103</sup> ἀργαλέος,<sup>104</sup> ἀτάρβητος,<sup>105</sup> κρατερός,<sup>106</sup> μέγας,<sup>107</sup> πυριγενής,<sup>108</sup> στυγερός<sup>109</sup>; as hand of Hades, ζοφερός<sup>110</sup> and φθονερός.<sup>111</sup> Αἰνός, in description of beasts and monsters, modifies δάκος,<sup>112</sup> δέμας,<sup>113</sup> νηδύς,<sup>114</sup> and πλευραί.<sup>115</sup> The nearest approach to the use given by the emendation is κέρας αἰνόν,<sup>116</sup> but this is not very near.

Two loci have παλάμη and αἰνός "back to back" or "like ships in the night". At *Argonautica* 4.456, Apsyrtus yields to αἰνοτάτησιν ὑποσχεσίησι; in 1.465, Jason attacks, ἀνασχόμενος παλάμη ξίφος. At *Cynegetica* 4.36—7, Oppian marshals the adversaries of the hunter: πόρδαλις οἶδ' ὅλοῃ παλαμάων λοίγιον ἰόν, / καὶ σθένος αἰνός ὅς μέγα λαϊνέοιο μετώπου. Each poet has αἰνός in mind; neither uses it of παλάμη. There is avoidance, too, between αἰνός and χεῖρ.<sup>117</sup>

Though negative evidence may not be conclusive, I am led to doubt that the phrase παλαμῆσιν αἰναῖς would have occurred to a Greek. Modern languages abound in such metaphorical expressions as 'blind hand', 'fell hand', 'des mains sans pitié leur donnèrent la mort'. But the Greek way with metaphor is different. Had Epiphania wanted to convey the meaning in the restoration, she might have chosen the word παλαμναῖος.<sup>118</sup>

Αἰνός is the more suspect because of the vexed word-order which it entails, unlike anything Epiphania has written. For simple predication,<sup>119</sup> in two of three cases, she has copula, subject, complement: ἦν . . . μοι χθών . . . Ἑλλάς (5—6); ἦν . . . ἐμοὶ γενέτης καὶ γαμέτης ναύκληροι (12—13). In the third and last, the order is complement, subject, copula: ὀλβιος δέ μοι βίος . . . ἦν (15—16). Coordinate elements are balanced,

<sup>99</sup> *Cyn.* 1.248. GVI 740, l. 3 (Amisos, II/III). CIG 4563, ll. 5—6 (Zorava) = EG 448; diff. rests. do not alter case.

<sup>100</sup> Theoc. 27.21.

<sup>101</sup> Hes. Sc. 397; *Cyn.* 2.517—8, in simile; *Hal.* 1.403 (sup.).

<sup>102</sup> *Il.* 17.565; AG 6.125.3 (Mnasalc.); A.R. 4.456.

<sup>103</sup> IG 12.7, 115, l. 6 (Arcesine, II/I).

<sup>104</sup> *Cyn.* 4.417 (of bears).

<sup>105</sup> AG 7.268.3 (Plato, of offense to a corpse).

<sup>106</sup> *Cyn.* 2.476.

<sup>107</sup> AG 6.97.6 (Antiphil., of Alexander).

<sup>108</sup> E. Or. 820, w. Schol.

<sup>109</sup> IG 9.1<sup>2</sup>, 313, l. 4 (Thyrrheum, IIa.).

<sup>110</sup> GVI 1989, l. 18 (Panticapaeum, II/I).

<sup>111</sup> IG 14, 2012 C, epigr. a l. 10 (Rome, 94 A.D. or later).

<sup>112</sup> *Hal.* 2.520 and 5.30—31 (comp.).

<sup>113</sup> *Cyn.* 3.274.

<sup>114</sup> *Hal.* 5.50.

<sup>115</sup> A.R. 1.946 (sup.).

<sup>116</sup> *Cyn.* 2.97 and 553.

<sup>117</sup> E.g.: *Il.* 8.316, 321; 8.449, 450; 13.49, 52; 14.385, 389; A.R. 1.944, 946; GVI 1313, 1.5 (Memphis, IIa.), both wds. in same vs., w. diff. refs.

<sup>118</sup> For this meaning, LSJ cites A. *Eu.* 448; S. *El.* 587, *Tr.* 1206—7; A.R. 4.708—9.

<sup>119</sup> With thoughtfully expressed; one statement is yet more simplified by brachylogy: Ἐπιφανία δέ μοι οὖνομα (II. 8—9).

sometimes with greater formality, sometimes with less: ἐκ μητρὸς Ἀθηναίας ἐφύην, πατρός τε Ἑρμιονέος (6—8); πολλήν μὲν ἐσεῖδον ἐγὼ γαῖαν, πᾶσάν τε ἐπλευσα θάλατταν (9—11); ἐν Μούσας ἐφύην, σοφίης τε μετέσχον (16—17). Longer *cola* remain free of intricacies. "Ἐστηκες ἐπ' ἐννοίᾳ λέγων, "ἄρα τίς ἦ πόθεν ἦδε;" (2—3) is appropriately conversational. More literary is φίλες τε λειπομένες, ὥς γυνή γυνηξί, πολλὰ παρέσχον, εἰς εὐσεβίην ἀφορῶσα (17—19). This is the second longest unit in the text, surpassed only by that containing the disputed lines: ἦν γὰρ ἔμοι γενέτης καὶ γαμέτης ναύκληροι, οὓς ἐθέμην παλαμῆσιν αἰ . . . αἰς ὑπὸ τύνβῳ θανόντας (12—15). Admittedly, the words οὓς . . . θανόντας occur at the affective climax of the recital; but this climax is sustained to l. 17, without hyperbata.

Radical displacement is warranted when it faithfully renders deep emotion. But here, if παλαμῆσιν αἰναῖς modifies θανόντας, the interposition of ὑπὸ τύνβῳ obscures the thought and plunges the tone into bathos. Ὑπὸ τύνβῳ is actually redundant, as τίθημι alone can mean 'bury'.<sup>120</sup> For the sense 'whom I laid to rest, by grim hands slaughtered', a careful writer might have omitted ὑπὸ τύνβῳ rather than place it ineffectively.

With each letter clear on the stone, and with no possibility of engraver's error, a text, however phrased, compels acceptance. But when a conjecture gives rise to clumsy word-order, one may well abandon both conjecture and word-order.

If παλαμῆσιν and its adjective denote Epiphania's hands, the clause in ll. 13—15 is symmetric: οὓς and θανόντας, the two words for her kin, mark the beginning and the end; they frame ἐθέμην and ὑπὸ τύνβῳ, the two expressions of burial; these, again, enclose παλαμῆσιν αἰ . . . αἰς, the adverbial phrase with ἐθέμην, at the center. This arrangement is neither illogical nor inartistic, and appears consistent with Epiphania's practice.

The choice, then, lies between the earlier readings. Of these, αἰμαῖς is condemned; firstly, because "it cannot stand for the Doric . . . possessive pronoun, nor . . . for ἀμετέραις or ἀμῶν αὐτῶν"<sup>121</sup>; and immediately thereafter, because it is impossible Greek.<sup>122</sup> Yet Tocilescu printed it<sup>123</sup>; Mihailov retained it;<sup>124</sup> Stoian did not use these arguments in correcting it<sup>125</sup>;

<sup>120</sup> E. g.: *Il.* 23.83; *A. Th.* 1002; *Th.* 1.138 ad fin.; *CIG* 5154 (Cyrene); *IG* 9.2, 931, 1.3 (Larisa); *IG* 9.2, 1201, 1.9 (Methone); *IG* 12.5, 65, ll. 9—11 (Naxos fere IIIp.); *IG* 12.5, 444, l. 112 (Chronicon Parium); *IG* 14, 1676 (Rome); *GEB* 29, l. 2 (Tomi); 92, ll. 2—3 (Diamopolis); 118, ll. 3—4 (Prilep); 127, l. 4 (Beroea, Maced.); *AEM* 10, 1886, p. 104 No 4 (Nova Zagora).

<sup>121</sup> *SCIV*, p. 137.

<sup>122</sup> *Ib.* *Un cuvînt grecesc în forma αἰμαῖς nu există în limba greacă.* Quoted in translation, p. 121—2 *supr.*, w. n. 34.

<sup>123</sup> *AEM* 19, p. 228, l. 9 of his text given below facsimile.

<sup>124</sup> *GEB* 21, l. 9.

<sup>125</sup> He saw ἀγναῖς on the stone (*Tomilana* p. 65, n. 5; *St. Cl.* 3, p. 118, n. 4) and printed it without comment on the earlier reading.

nor did the Roberts in their chronicle.<sup>126</sup> Αἵμαῖς could have resulted from the change ε > αι, which is attested in epigraphy.<sup>127</sup>

But final judgment should not be made without scrutiny of the damaged area — if necessary, by squeeze, special lighting, magnification or photographic close-up. This, it is hoped, would settle both doubts about the word with παλαμῆσιν: whether the second letter is a *gamma* or an *iota*; and whether the last letter before the case-ending is a *mu* or a *nu*. The stone seems to show ΑΓΓΑΙΣ. Pace Sauciuc-Săveanu, I observe that the stem-stroke following the initial *alpha* is joined at its top by a short but clear horizontal drawn to the viewer's right, though admittedly with a downward slant. This configuration does not look like any *iota* on the stone. Even if no more of the upper stroke were recoverable, the letter might still be an original *gamma* which lost most of its horizontal through damage, weathering or both. The next form, ΙΓ, I take to be the remains of a *nu*; and, following Stoian, I read ἀγναῖς.

The restored clause runs οὓς ἐθέμην παλαμῆσιν ἀγναῖς ὑπὸ τύνβῳ θανόντας: 'whom I laid to rest, with consecrated hands, in the tomb, when they had died.' This interpretation seems valid: burial was always a sacred duty. That it could be a difficult one, that it was sometimes neglected, that people feared this neglect by their survivors, makes its faithful performance worthy of note. In her own words, Epiphania ordered her conduct εἰς εὐσεβίην ἀφορῶσα (l. 19).

Other problems, in ll. 20–22, require examination. Kuzos, who first printed this epitaph, has the lines read: Καὶ δὴ κλεινήρη κάματον πολὺν ἐνεγκαμένη ἔγνω σαφῶς οὐ κατ' εὐσέβιαν εἰσιν αἱ θνητῶν τύχαι.<sup>128</sup> His text leaves much to be desired<sup>129</sup>; for instance, ll. 20–21 on the stone clearly show ΕΙΝΕΝΑ — rather than the classic orthography (Fig. I). Perhaps this is why ἐνεγκαμένη was ignored and all subsequent editors give ἐνένκαμεν.<sup>130</sup> Perhaps, too, this is why Stoian makes κλεινηρηκάματον a compound.

Stoian believes that the report of Epiphania's charity, begun in l. 17, continues through the lines discussed here. He renders them: 'I provided

<sup>126</sup> Bul. Ép., REG75, 1962, p. 186 No 231; ib., 78, 1935, p. 134 No 265; they record successive emendations without discussing the merits.

<sup>127</sup> E.g. IG 12.7, 289, l. 2 (Minoa); IG 14, 1479, l. 9 (Rome); IPE 4, 295, l. 3 (Panticapaëum & vic., aet. Rom.); MAMA 4, 117, l. 2 (Lysias, III); AEM 7, 1883, p. 173 No 10, l. 4 (Brussa, Asia Minor); AEM 15, 1892, p. 206f. No 73, l. 9 (Konino); AEM 19, 1896, p. 100f. No 52, l. 5 (Tomi); Sb. 16 (1900), p. 67f. No 9, l. 2 (Saladinovo); SEG 24, 776, l. 6 (Constantinople); D 396, l. 8; DH, p. 315M, l. 7 (Serdica); DH, p. 337 No 46, ll. 7–8; p. 380f. 72, l. 7 (Heraclea Perinthos); Kal. 47, l. 5 (Zaribrod); 264, l. 2 (Odessus); 291, l. 4 (ib.); GEB 14, perh. l. 4, also l. 5 (Tomi) — v. Mihailov, *La Langue des Inscriptions grecques en Bulgarie: Phonétique et Morphologie*, Университетска Библиотека, 279 (Sofia, 1943), p. 33 — GEB 54, l. 2 (Marcianopolis); 128, l. 2 (Ber); GVI 621, ad fin. (Xanthus, I/II); GVI 675a, l. 6 (Cotiaeum, IIP.).

<sup>128</sup> Ἀθηνᾶ, p. 347.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Stoian, *Tomitana* p. 65, n. 3; and St.Cl. 3, p. 188, n. 3.

<sup>130</sup> Tocilescu, AEM 19, p. 228, l. 14 of text below facsim.; Mihailov, GEB 21 — I, 26, l. Stoian, *Tomitana*, p. 66, init.; and St.Cl. 3, p. 188; SEG 24, 1081, ll. 20–1.

much help for the woman confined to her bed of suffering; as I was well aware that the destiny of mortals is not in accordance with their piety.<sup>131</sup>

It seems that κλεινηρηκάματον can be a feminine, from a compound adjective of two terminations; here, then, it would be used substantively as 'the one suffering invalidism', 'the bed-ridden patient'. Φέρω certainly means 'to bear, as a gift'; and ἐνένκαμεν may be a literary plural,<sup>132</sup> though unique in the text. But ἔγνω, which is beyond challenge on the stone (ΕΓΝΩ. l. 21), must surely be a third person singular.<sup>133</sup>

Therefore, — with my head on the block — I venture the following interpretation. The words καὶ δὴ et seq. are by Hermogenes, Epiphania's second husband, who provided this tomb (ll. 23–25). He makes her the subject, understood, both of ἔγνω and of the aoristic element from φέρω. This latter has the sense 'bear: endure, undergo'. It takes the direct object κλεινηρηκάματον, a masculine compound noun which means 'burden of wasting illness', 'suffering of the bed-ridden'; and which is modified by πολύν.

Venturing further, I suggest that in ll. 20–21 φέρω may actually have the form given by Kuzos: the aorist middle participle ἐνενακαμένη.<sup>134</sup> The stone seems to have ΕΝΕΝΚΑΜΕΝ-ΕΓΝΩ. There is plainly a horizontal stroke between the last *nu* of ἐνενακαμεν- and the *epsilon* of ἔγνω; but it does not touch the verticals on either side. It could be a punctuation, or a scar; or, after all, part of an *eta* in ligature. Again, to clear up this uncertainty, the stone should be re-examined. Meanwhile, for purposes of discussion, I adopt ἐνενακαμένη from Kuzos. My translation is: '— Yes; and having endured much suffering as an invalid, she knew beyond doubt: the fate of mortals does not match their piety.'

If the *eta* were discarded, Hermogenes would be saying '— Yes; and we endured — ἐνένκαμεν — great affliction in a wasting illness.' Then by asyndeton 'She knew . . . ' I insist on making Hermogenes the author of these lines; firstly because ἔγνω seems to admit no other explanation; and also because I cannot believe that Epiphania passed him over in silence, which is the inescapable alternative.

It seems that she must have concluded, shortly after l. 19, with a wife's farewell to Hermogenes; and, possibly, a gracious leave-taking of the παροδείτης to balance her greeting in l. 1. I believe that Hermogenes replaced these closing words with a much longer text — ll. 20–25 as

<sup>131</sup> " . . . am ajutat mult pe cea reținută pe patul de suferință. Căci mi-am dat bine seama că nu pe măsura pietății lor este soarta muritorilor." — *Tomitana*, p. 65. StCl. 3 gives only the Greek text with no translation.

<sup>132</sup> Smyth §§ 1008, 1009. The word is always accented ἐνένκαμεν; I wonder if there might be any possibility of ἐνενακάμεν, for ἡνεγκάμην, with this sense.

<sup>133</sup> I have found nothing in LSJ s.v. γινώσκω, nor in Smyth § 682, which would allow any other interpretation. Buck, in *The Greek Dialects* . . . (U. of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 77, discusses "loss of final *v*"; but gives no example or this kind. Nor does he in his treatment of personal endings, pp. 111 & 115–7. Mihailov, in *La Langue des Inscriptions grecques en Bulgarie*, does cite a verb-form among examples for "disparition de *v* . . . en finale absolue" (p. 75); but he does not include ἔγνω; nor is it discussed under "desinences personnelles actives" (pp. 157–9). He mentions it only as one item of evidence for the "aoriste athématique . . . encore vivant" (p. 179) without commenting specifically on it.

<sup>134</sup> Mihailov alone mentions this word in *La Langue* . . . ; and he takes it as the finite form, pp. 72–3, 158, 163–4.

seen on the stone; but at a time when the epitaph was already being carved. This would account for the progressive crowding of the inscription.

The text I propose, with maximal restorations, is as follows<sup>135</sup>:

Χαῖρε, παροδεῖτα. — Καὶ σ[ύ].—  
 "Ἔστηκες ἐπ' ἐννοίᾳ<sup>136</sup> λέγων  
 "Ἄρα<sup>137</sup> τίς ἦ πόθεν ἤδε;" ἄκου-  
 ε δὴ, ξεῖνε, πάτραν καὶ οὐ-  
 νομα τοῦμόν· ἦν μὲν μοι  
 χθών<sup>138</sup> τὸ πρὶν 'Ελλάς· ἐκ μη-  
 τρὸς 'Αθηναίας ἐφύην, πα-  
 τρός τε 'Ερμιονέος· 'Επιφα-  
 νία δέ μοι οὐνομα. Πολλήν  
 μὲν ἐσεῖδον ἐγὼ γαῖαν, πᾶσάν  
 τε ἔπλευσα θάλατταν.<sup>139</sup>  
 ἦν γὰρ ἐμοὶ γενέτης καὶ γαμέτης  
 ναύκληροι, οὓς ἐθέμην  
 παλαμῆσιν ἄγναῖς ὑπὸ τύνβῳ  
 θανόντας. "Ὀλβιος δέ μοι βίος  
 τὸ πρὶν ἦν· ἐν Μούσας ἐφύην, σοφί-  
 ης τε μετέσχον. Φίλες τε λειπο-  
 μένες ὡς γυνὴ γυνηξὶ πολλὰ πα-  
 ρέσχον, εἰς εὐσεβίην ἀφορῶσα . . .<sup>140</sup>  
 — Καὶ δὴ κλεινηρηκάματον<sup>141</sup> πολὺν ἐ-  
 νενκαμένη, ἐγὼ σαφῶς: οὐ κατ' εὐ-  
 σεβίαν εἰσὶν αἱ θνητῶν τύχαι.  
 'Ερμογένης 'Ανκυρανὸς καὶ Τομίτης  
 φυλῆς Οἰνώπων<sup>142</sup> τῇ ἑαυτοῦ συνβίῳ  
 εὐχαριστῶν<sup>143</sup> μνησίας χάριν ἀνέθηκα.

<sup>135</sup> These are the variants in printing which should be mentioned. L. 2: Kuzos has ἔστηκες ἐπ' ἐννοί, ἀλ' ἐγών... L. 3: ἄρα Kuzos and Stoian in StCl. 3, 188; all other transcriptions show ἄρα. L. 7: 'Αθηνάας, Stoian in Tomitana, p. 65 and SEG 24 No 1081, p. 302, l. 7. This must be a printer's error: the *iota* is clear on the stone (Fig. I). L. 14: τύμβῳ, Kuzos; everyone else has τύνβ — as on the stone. L. 20: καὶ δέ, Stoian in Tomitana, p. 65; and StCl. 3, p. 188; so too SEG 24, 1081, p. 302, l. 20. The stone clearly shows ΔΗ (Fig. I). L. 24: συμβίῳ, Kuzos; everyone else has σύνβ as on the stone.

<sup>136</sup> For ἐπ' ἐννοίᾳ, cf. D. 18.273.

<sup>137</sup> On epigraphic echoes of τίς [...] πόθεν; v. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 4, 1948, p. 47 w. n. 8 & ib. No 151.

<sup>138</sup> For χθών = 'this earth, ... this land', v. Mihailov, GEB 21, I, 26, n. ad l. 4; cf. also A. Eu. 765—6; E. Alc. 747f.; A.R. 1.992—3, 2.946, 964; 3.310—1; 4.265—6, 398, al.

<sup>139</sup> On voyaging, cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 2, 1946, pp. 103—5 and 107—8, w. nn.; IG 5.1, 728 (Laconia); IG 12.5, 764, l. 1 (Andros, aet. Christ.); GVI 1056, l. 2 (Rome, IIp.). The closest Homeric echo I have found is GVI 1183 (Heraclea = L. & J. Robert, *La Carie* 2, 189f.)

<sup>140</sup> Cf. GVI 1169, ll. 3—4 (Rome, III/IV).

<sup>141</sup> For κλεινηρη — cf., e.g., BGU 45.10—15 (IIp.).

<sup>142</sup> For another member of the Oinopes recently discovered in Tomi, Dacia NS 7, 1963, p. 553f. No 1, l. 3 (2d. h. IIp.).

<sup>143</sup> On εὐχαριστῶν, cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 10, 1955, pp. 55—62; and Chr. August Lobeck, *Phrynichi Eclogae* (Leipzig, 1820), p. 18.

This epitaph has a great variety of word-forms. Like a true daughter of an Athenian mother (ll. 6–7), Epiphania writes θάλατταν (l. 11). For the phonemes α/η, she uses free choice: πάτραν (l. 4), γαῖαν (l. 10); but γενέτης... γαμέτης (l. 12), σοφίης (ll. 16–17), εὔσεβίην (ll. 20); εὔσεβίαν (ll. 21–22) I think is by Hermogenes. Epiphania alternates ἐσεῖδον (l. 10) with εἰς εὔσεβίην (l. 19). She has the literary forms ξεῖνε (l. 4), οὔνομα (ll. 4–5, l. 9) τοῦμόν (l. 5) and Ἑρμιονέος (l. 18).<sup>144</sup>

Other words have undergone change. *Iota* “subscript” is lost: the stone reads ΕΠ ΕΝΝΟΙΑ (l. 2), ΥΠΟ ΤΥΝΒΩ (l. 14), ΤΗ... ΣΥΝΒΙΩ (l. 24). Παροδεῖτα (l. 1) and κλεινηρη — < κλιν- — (l. 20) show ι > ι;<sup>145</sup> but Hermogenes calls himself a Τομίτης (l. 23). Vowel-shifts also occur in dative plurals: παλαμῆσιν (l. 14); Μούσας (l. 16), φίλες (l. 17), λειπομένες (ll. 17–18) with αι > ε; and γυνήξιν (l. 18) with αι > η. There is consonantal change as well: both spouses write -νβ- for -μβ-; Epiphania has τύνβω (l. 14) and Hermogenes, συνβίω (l. 24). Hermogenes also puts -νκ- for -νγ-: ἐνεκκαμένη (ll. 20–21), Ἀνκυρανός (l. 23).

Epiphania draws her words and phrases from various modes of discourse. Poetry yields the greatest number: πάτραν (l. 4), this sense of χθών (l. 6), ἐφύην (ll. 7, 16), ἐσεῖδον (l. 10), γαῖαν (l. 10), γενέτης (l. 12), γαμέτης (l. 12), παλαμῆσιν (l. 14), ὄλβιος (l. 15), φίλες (l. 17), and this sense of λειπομένες (ll. 17–18). Homer is echoed in the stranger’s question, τίς ἦ πόθεν; (l. 3); and in Epiphania’s reminiscence: πολλήν μὲν ἐσεῖδον ἐγὼ γαῖαν, πᾶσάν τε ἐπλευσα θάλατταν (ll. 9–11). Philosophy seems to have prompted her choice of ἐννοία (l. 2); it surely led her to write σοφίης τε μετέσχον (ll. 16–17). Ἀφορᾶν εἰς... (l. 19) may also have philosophical overtones.<sup>146</sup> Lastly, πολλὰ παρέσχον may come from the official language of decrees.<sup>147</sup>

Two syntactical points should be noted. Epiphania says ἦν γὰρ ἐμοὶ γενέτης καὶ γαμέτης ναύκληροισιν (ll. 12–13) putting a singular verb before two singular subjects, with a plural noun as complement. This recalls the Pindaric construction; though the latter is shown with a singular verb before two plural subjects.<sup>148</sup> Her husband, when

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Smyth §§ 275, 275D, 276, 277a; Buck pp. 91–2. This is *pace* Mihailov, *La Langue* pp. 57 and 140, who takes Ἑρμιονέος as variant genit. of proper n. Ἑρμιονης, -ου. Everyone else who discusses this point — Tocilescu, *AEM* 19, p. 229; Robert, *Hellenica* 4, 1948, p. 48, cont. of n. 8, p. prec.; and Stoian, *Tomitana* p. 65 and *StCl.* 3, p. 188 — understands Epiphania as saying in ll. 6–8 ‘I was born of an Athenian mother and a father who was from Hermione’. This interpretation is followed here. Ἑρμιονέος occurs in *Hdt.* e.g., 7.6. (It can be noted that, when there was coincidence of personal name and place name, mention is made of the fact; e.g.: IG 2/3<sup>2</sup>, 7447, ll. 1–2; IGB 1, 223, l. 3 of surviv. (Odessus); GVI 1816, l. 7 (Mysia, I); *AEM* 19, 1896, p. 224f. No 91, l. 10 — the latter is one of the stones found with that in this report.

<sup>145</sup> This is one of the most widely attested changes. Cf. Buck, p. 31; Mihailov, *La Langue*, p. 31.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Arr. *Epict.* 2.19.29, 3.24.17.

<sup>147</sup> But this is also a literary use, e.g.: *Od.* 14.250–1, 15.489–90, 18.360; *Hdt.* 2.180, 4.83; *Th.* 8.47; *D.* 21.155.

<sup>148</sup> Smyth § 961, w. ref. to 464a De, and prose example, *Rep.* 462e.

he "signs" the memorial, does so by anacoluthon: 'Ερμογένης . . . τῇ ἑαυτοῦ συνβίῳ . . . ἀνέθηκα (ll. 23—25).<sup>149</sup>

The style admits both avoidance and tolerance of hiatus. There are two cases of elision: ἐπ' ἐννοίᾳ (L. 2) and κατ' εὐσεβίαν (ll. 21—22); the latter I attribute to Hermogenes. Crasis appears once: τοῦμόν (l. 5). Movable consonants are found twice: παλαμῆσιν (l. 14) and εἰσὶν (l. 22); the latter I think is by Hermogenes. Over against these are eight occurrences of hiatus: ἥδε; ἄκουε (ll. 3—4), καὶ οὖνομα (ll. 4—5), τε Ἑρμιονέος (l. 8), μοι οὖνομα (l. 9), τε ἐπλευσα (l. 11), ναύκληροι οὖς (l. 13), ἐνενοκαμένη ἔγνω (ll. 21—22; restored; I think by Hermogenes), τῇ ἑαυτοῦ (l. 24, Hermogenes).

Epiphania uses her resources to avoid monotony. She articulates the stranger's unspoken question: τίς ἢ πόθεν (l. 3); then assures him of a reply in chiastic order: ἄκουε . . . πάτρην καὶ οὖνομα (ll. 3—5). Her own plan is then followed, but with a difference: she gives πάτρην in both senses — χθών (ll. 5—6) and γένος (ll. 6—8) — before proceeding to οὖνομα. Synonyms are called on: παροδεῖτα (l. 1) and ξεῖνε (l. 4), πάτρην (l. 4) and χθών (l. 6), πατρός (ll. 7—8) and γενέτης (l. 12).

But she achieves balance and consonance. The phrases ἐκ μητρὸς Ἀθηναίας and πατρός τε Ἑρμιονέος (ll. 6—8) show pariosis and paro-miosis. So do ἐν Μούσαις ἐφύην, σοφίης τε μετέσχον (ll. 16—17) though here the phonetic pattern is less strict. Pariosis and homoioteleuton mark πολλὰ μὲν ἐσεῖδον ἐγὼ γαῖαν, πᾶσάν τε ἐπλευσα θάλατταν (ll. 9—11). Γενέτης καὶ γαμέτης (l. 12) emphasize their kinship with parechesis. Another example of the latter, ὀλβίος . . . βίος, (l. 15), may be a kind of *figura etymologica*: that person is ὀλβίος whose βίος is most truly lived, with "the exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence."<sup>150</sup> For the βίος is immediately described: to grow up among the Muses and to share in wisdom.

When attempting to derive from the words some knowledge of the people who wrote them, an observer encounters difficulties; for all the many lines crowding the stone, Greek reticence has truly been maintained. The objective data do not much exceed those in the older epitaphs: "Here lies A, daughter of B, wife of C; she was a good woman and lived blamelessly." On one point, this text is even less communicative: Epiphania does not name her kindred.<sup>151</sup>

Also, she tells her story as "a fugue in time".<sup>152</sup> It begins at the beginning, with birthplace, parentage, and name (ll. 5—9); but then follow the voyages (ll. 9—11), which could have taken place at any time,

<sup>149</sup> Cf. Mihailov, *La Langue*, p. 149 w. refs.; and SEG 24, 952, ll. 1, 7—8 (nr. Vraca, ex. IIIp.); AEM 9, 1885, p. 124 No 84, l. 2 (Ancyra); AEM 19, 1896, p. 98 No 46, ll. 3, 5 (Tomi); Sb. 16 (1900), p. 67f. No 9, ll. 3—4 (Saladinovo); il. shows plainly, Fig. 35, p. 68, but not so transcribed; Dacia NS 7, 1963, p. 553f. No 1, ll. 4—5 (Tomi, 2d. h. IIp.).

<sup>150</sup> Edith Hamilton, *The Greek Way to Western Civilization* (New American Library, MP 513, rep. 1948), p. 21.

<sup>151</sup> V. n. 144 *supr.* Again, *La Langue*, p. 105, is alone in taking, Ἀθηναίας (l. 7) as "nom de femme". Perhaps Epiphania felt that the names of her family would have no relevance to this land and these people.

<sup>152</sup> Subtitle of the novel *Take Three Tenses*, by one of the Godden sisters. Cf. Peek, *GG, Einführung*, p. 14, ad No 40.

or continually, from early childhood<sup>153</sup> to adulthood. Thoughts of travel recall her father and introduce her husband to the narrative (ll. 12). The inquirer learns their occupation; and immediately afterward, is told of their deaths and their burial, provided by Epiphania herself (ll. 13–15). From death she looks back to joy (l. 15 θανόντας ὄλβιος with only a stop between them), and has it sum up a whole phase of her life (ll. 15–16), illustrated by a scene from childhood — ἐν Μούσεσς ἐφύην (l. 16). But she does not say when, or exactly how, that phase ended. The bereavements could have been the first, or the worst, strokes of misfortune; and could have come simultaneously or separately. The cause of death, too, is passed over in silence. Epiphania says only that she did the right thing. Finally, her pursuit of wisdom (ll. 16–17) and her help to women in need (ll. 17–19), might, according to circumstances, have been limited in time or continued throughout her adult life.

The data are inconclusive and the risk of documentary fallacy is great; but it may be useful to note other alternatives which the text allows. Epiphania's mother could have been an only, or only surviving, child; her husband would then have had to carry on the family enterprise; and a search for the best prospect could have led to the man from Hermione. Or, two ναύκληροι might have sealed a partnership with the marriage of their children. The couple could have lived in Athens, or Hermione, or both. Epiphania's mother might have died when the child was still very young; perhaps then the skipper had taken his little daughter to bear him company. Or, the whole family might have traveled together; and the Athenian mother, assuming that she had lived, could have been Epiphania's teacher. The child grown may have provided help to women of the seafaring community; or aided φίλας λειπομένας whoever they were; ὡς γυνή γυνήξί (l. 18) suggests the latter.

Now, to partake of wisdom requires only a good mind and a wise companion; but the doing of charity, to be effective, requires at least easy circumstances. Epiphania may have had wherewith to give because her father and first husband were men who went down to the sea in ships. These ναύκληροι — <sup>154</sup> "known throughout the Greek world from the fifth century B.C. onwards" — <sup>155</sup> became, during Roman times, both private entrepreneurs and employees of the state; <sup>156</sup> in the latter role they transported grain to feed the urban populace and lumber to heat the baths.<sup>157</sup> For these vital services, they received compensations and privileges.<sup>158</sup>

<sup>153</sup> For evidence of children on voyages, e.g.: IG 12.7, 445 (Aegiale); GVI 1985 (Piraeus, c. 360a.).

<sup>154</sup> Professor D. M. Pippidi, who graciously allowed me to read extensively from his *Scythica Minora*, Bucarest—Amsterdam, 1975, while this work was still in proof, cites, p. 100, n. 33, "sur le sens de ναύκληροι... L. Robert dans *Annaire du Collège de France*, LXII, 1961/62, p. 343 et 'Αρχ. 'Εφημ., 1969."

<sup>155</sup> Stoeckle, s.v. *Navicularii*, RE 16. 2, col. 1901, ll. 13–14.

<sup>156</sup> Id., RE 1902, l. 63–1903, l. 2; 1911, ll. 24–39 and 44–57; 1913, l. 55–1914 l. 41, w. refs.

<sup>157</sup> *Ib.* resp. 1913, ll. 13–33 and 1918, ll. 21–23, citing Cod. Theod. XIII/5, 10 (364).

<sup>158</sup> *Ib.*, 1911, ll. 8–12; 1914, l. 42–1915, l. 6; 1931, ll. 13–29, and the section "Privilegien", 1927, l. 36ff. w. refs.



Their situation was for a time so enviable that persons with no color of claim used subterfuge to join their professional associations,<sup>159</sup> a tactic met by stern counter-measures from the Emperors.<sup>160</sup> Ultimately, with the deepening crisis of the Empire, the state-services grew so burdensome, and attempts at evasion so commonplace, that the ναύκληροι and their guilds were beset with progressively stricter compulsion from the authorities, reducing them to utter subjection.<sup>161</sup>

It was natural for the ναύκληροι<sup>162</sup> to be a presence in Tomi, Epiphania's last home. For here was one of the best ports<sup>163</sup> in those regions *quas maiores nostri iure Cereris horreum nominabant*.<sup>164</sup> Here the κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων — originally Πεντάπολις, then Ἐξάπολις — had its center.<sup>165</sup> And here the Roman provincial administration made its headquarters.<sup>166</sup> From the time of the good Emperors comes attestation of the οἶκος τῶν ἐν Τόμει ναυκλήρων<sup>167</sup> and of an οἶκος τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων,<sup>168</sup> which might have included seafarers as well as traders, and which furthered the cult of Sarapis.

The Egyptians, whose influence is thus recorded, were, "already in pre-Roman times"<sup>169</sup> settling Tomi and its immediate neighborhood.<sup>170</sup> But "from the early period of Roman rule," when Tomi "began . . . to be . . . a focus of immigration from all parts of the Mediterranean world and the Black Sea area,"<sup>171</sup> they took second place numerically to the arrivals from southern Greece and Asia Minor.<sup>172</sup> Among the former may have been Epiphania's father, who was from Hermione (Il. 7—8).<sup>173</sup> Among the latter was her second husband, Hermogenes of Ancyra, "who obtained citizenship" in Tomi "and was registered in the tribe of the Οἰνωπες." (Il. 23—25).

Hermogenes takes up the word Epiphania used to tell her motive for charity: εὐσεβίην (l. 19) / εὐσεβίαν (Il. 21—22). He could be saying :

<sup>159</sup> *Ib.*, 1901, l. 31—1902, l. 9; 1903, l. 34—1904, l. 19, w. refs.

<sup>160</sup> *Ib.*, 1912, ll. 6—13; 1915, ll. 11—18, w. refs.

<sup>161</sup> *Ib.*, 1911, ll. 25—28, 39—43; 1915, ll. 50—1; and the following section, "Periode des staatlichen Zwangs", 1916, ll. 52ff.

<sup>162</sup> For ναύκληροι à Tomis, attestés à titre individuel, Pippidi cites Tocilescu, AEM, XIX, 1896, p. 101 No 53 and *Fouilles et recherches archéologiques en Roumanie*, p. 220 No 55 = IGR I 645 (*Scythica Minora*, p. 100, n. 33 fin.).

<sup>163</sup> Chr. M. Danoff, s.v. Tomi, RE Supplbd. 9, col. 1401, ll. 7—11; 1416, ll. 3—9.

<sup>164</sup> Solinus 21.3 (Mommson), ap. Danoff, RE 1401, ll. 28—29.

<sup>165</sup> Danoff, 1404, ll. 32—61; 1418, ll. 44—56, w. refs.

<sup>166</sup> *Ib.*, 1409, ll. 40—41; 1412, ll. 5—10, w. refs.

<sup>167</sup> Pippidi, *Scythica Minora*, p. 100, n. 33, cites Robert, opp. cit. ad n. 154 supr., for this sense of οἶκος; and for the inscriptions gives the refs. *Bull. Soc. archéol. de Sens*, 1854, p. 124 = IGR I 160, cf. Allard, *La Bulgarie orientale...* (Paris, 1864), p. 285; and Νεῖα Πανδώρα, June 1 1868, No 7.

<sup>168</sup> Pippidi, *Sc. Min.*, p. 100 and n. 32 which gives the date of the inscription — March 26, 160 — and the documentation: Allard, *La Bulgarie orientale...*, p. 283 No 2; Tocilescu, *Fouilles...*, p. 224, No 1; IGR I 604; Brillant, *Rev. Philol.*, XXXI, 1912, p. 284.

<sup>169</sup> Danoff, 1411, ll. 23—24.

<sup>170</sup> *Ib.*, ll. 25—33, w. refs.

<sup>171</sup> *Ib.*, 1409, ll. 34—37.

<sup>172</sup> *Ib.*, 1409, ll. 47—49 and 1410, ll. 61—62.

<sup>173</sup> Danoff, in his paragraph on immigration from southern Greece and Asia Minor, cites Epiphania's inscription first among his examples (1409, ll. 50—59) and mentions her father first (Il. 52—54).

<sup>174</sup> Danoff, 1409, ll. 57—59.

'Yes; and her own experience shows that one can suffer undeservedly'; or perhaps he could have meant: 'Yes; and though she did good, her fate was to suffer' — *neque [Pietatem, quam] ... sanctissime colui[t] ... gratiam rettuli[t]*.<sup>175</sup>

To what σεβαστά this piety was directed, is a question no one has yet raised. It may then be well to state here my belief that both Epiphania and Hermogenes were pagans.<sup>176</sup> Despite the mission of Paul, there was for a long time no substantial Christian community in Athens. Greek gods had their ἐπιφάνειαι;<sup>177</sup> A Greek girl's name could refer to one of these, or come from the title 'Ἐπιφανής of a human lord. Private charity was not the exclusive province of Jews and Christians.<sup>178</sup> The name 'Ἐρμο/γένης is thoroughly pagan, as is the form of the monument he gave his wife. And the Muses would surely not appear, even as a literary convention, in a Christian epitaph, until paganism had ceased to be a threat.<sup>179</sup>

Yet the Muses — those uniquely Hellenic deities — were no "pat device, like the uninspired statues in our universities."<sup>180</sup> They had become goddesses of culture — music, literature, mathematics, science, philosophy.<sup>181</sup> They were invoked not only by creative and performing artists, teachers and philosophers; but also, and commonly, by "ordinary" people — readers, auditors, amateurs.<sup>182</sup> These men and women testified

<sup>175</sup> Cic. *Fam.* 14.4.1 ad fin., through a glass darkly.

<sup>176</sup> I owe this discussion to the kind help of Professors Gilbert Highet and Morton Smith.

<sup>177</sup> Cf., e. g. Hom. *H.* 33, w. direct bearing on Epiphania's family.

<sup>178</sup> Cf., e.g. SEG 2, 521 (Rome); EG 366, 1. 3 (Cotiaeum, inf. aet.); GVI 1164, 1. 7 (Rome, II/III).

<sup>179</sup> I think the point can hold, despite some observations in the contrary sense of Richmond Lattimore. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1962), pp. 301ff.; cf. pp. 320–1.

<sup>180</sup> Rendered from Pierre Boyancé, *Le Culte des Muses chez les Philosophes grecs: Études d'Histoire et de Psychologies Religieuses*, Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 141. Paris, 1937, p. 262; for the references and the groundwork of this discussion, I am deeply indebted to Professor D. M. Pippidi of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, *qui erranti comiler monstravit utam*. Any misunderstandings or other faults are entirely mine.

<sup>181</sup> The great end of Boyancé's book is to illuminate the Platonic texts declaring the virtues of music, the sphere of the Muses; and finding the best of it in philosophy. He cites, e.g., *Rep.* 548b, *Phaedr.* 259d (p. 262, n. 1), *Phaed.* 61a — the great proof-text, cf. *Laches* 188c ff., *Laws* 689d (p. 262, n. 2). Salient points in his discussion: pp. 145–6, 165, 231–2, 249–50, 261–2, 289, and 319.

<sup>182</sup> Cf. Henri Irénée Marrou, Μουσικός Ἀνὴρ: *Étude sur les Scènes de la Vie Intellectuelle figurant sur les Monuments funéraires romains*. Réimpression anastatique augmentée d'une postface (Rome, 1964), pp. 213–216 and 225–226. His examples: No 20, 21, 23, 56, 60, 82, 102, 103, 108–110, 155, 192, 197, 206, 208, 209, 211, 212, 215, 217. He cites other examples: Fröhner 398 (p. 113), Matz-Duhn 3278 (ib.) and 3281 (p. 144) and Schorn, *Beschreibung der Glyptothek* 190 (p. 113). Inscriptional examples: CIG 923 (Athens, comm. differentiates deceased fr. lexicographer); CIG 1925k (Ithaca), 2004 (nr. Heraclea Lyncestis), 6421b (Rome); IG 2/3<sup>2</sup>, 12514 (Athens, IIP.); IG 4, 53 (Aegina, w. interp. of Boyancé, p. 37); IG 12.2, 443 (Mytilene); IG 12.5, 242 w. add. 445 B (Paros, Maced. or Rom. era?); IG 12.5, 676 (Syros, II/III); IG 14, 1770 (Rome, = Marrou 71); IGB 1<sup>2</sup>, 464 (Philippopolis, II/III); IGB 3, 1024 (Philippopolis); IRB 144 (Panticapaeum and vic.); SEG 6, 798 (Nicomolis Armenia Minoris, IIP., w. Wilh.); SEG 7, 269 (Syria, IIP.); SEG 12, 339 (Beroea, Maced., IIP., p. post); SEG 18, 503, ll. 7–10 (Smyrna? IIP.); EG 207 (Halicarnassus, I fere p.), 238 (Smyrna, I fere a.), 413 (Asia Min.? Ia./IP.), 415 (Alexandria?), 551 (Rome, II v. III), 614 (Rome, II fere s.), 674 (Rome, p. 201 A.D.?); GEB 119 (Prilep); GG 151 (Samos, II/1?), 252 (Thespieae, Boeotia, IIP.), 336 (Rome, I/II), 358 (Miletupolis, Phrygia, IIP.), 396 (Rome, I/II), 448 (on road Naples/Nola, IP.).

that intelligence is the greatest gift, and culture the finest possession, distinguishing them from beast and savage, consummating their humanity, enhancing leisure, transfiguring solitude, making better citizens<sup>183</sup> and braver soldiers.<sup>184</sup>

Therefore, the education of the young was a vital duty. Parents commemorating children who had shown promise dwelt on the fact that their sons and daughters had been reared ἐν Μούσαις.<sup>185</sup> Adults too, like Epiphania, acknowledged the Muses' fostering. The Rhodian epitaph of another σοφίης μέτοχος<sup>186</sup> declares that his companions offered sacrifice ἄζόμενοι Μούσαις, τὸν αἰδιδίμον, αἷ σε τιθηναῖς/χερσὶ Πλατωνεῖους θρέψαν ὑπ' ἄτραπιτοῦς.<sup>187</sup> From the region of Panticapaeum comes the epitaph of a good man and true τὸμ Μοῦσαι παίδευσαν.<sup>188</sup>

Devotion to the Muses was early<sup>189</sup> and often institutionalized in the form of a θιάσος — a "religious guild" or "confraternity".<sup>190</sup> The *Life* of Sophocles has φησὶ δὲ καὶ Ἰστρός... αὐτὸν... ταῖς... Μούσαις θιάσον ἐκ τῶν πεπααιδευμένων συναγαγεῖν.<sup>191</sup> The Academy was such a θιάσος,<sup>192</sup> as was the Lyceum.<sup>193</sup> The existence of similar groups among "ordinary" people is attested by Pausanias, in his notice on the house of Pulytion at Athens;<sup>194</sup> and by the Testament of Epikteta from Thera.<sup>195</sup> A Μουσεῖον, privately established at Istros in the third century, was made a municipal

<sup>183</sup> From the beginning: *Theog.* 60. Cf. Epicharmus ap. Serv. *Aen.* 1.8; Plut. *Frat. am.* 6 — in Maximilian Mayer, s.v. Musai, 1), RE 16.1, col. 705, l. 62—706, l.4. Boyancé, p. 237, n. 4 recapitulates them re Iambl. VP 45, ib., n. 3:

<sup>184</sup> Contra the ῥίψασσις. E.g., IG 9.1<sup>2</sup>, 2 No 298 (Thyrrheum. IIa.?). The other voice of Archilochus is echoed in IG 12.1, 148 (Rhodes).

<sup>185</sup> Marron No 3,4,8,12,13,18,19. Inscriptions, e.g.: IG 2/3<sup>2</sup>, 13148 (Athens, II/III); IG, 5.1, 1186 (Gythium, s. la. part. prior.); IG 7, 2541 (Thebes); IG 9.1<sup>2</sup>, 2 No 314 (Thyrrheum, IIa.); IG 9.2, 639 (Larisa, ca. Chr. nat.?). IG 12.7, 449 (Aegiale, IIa. latest); IG 12.8, 442 (Thasos); IG 14, 1714 (Rome); IG 14, 2012B, ll. 3—4 (Rome, 94 A.D. or later); *Samm.* 3990 (Alexandria, aet. Constantin.); SEG 6,635 (Pisidia, IIP. = TAM 3.1, 798, w. diff. attrib.); SEG 19,728 (nr. Miletropolis Mysia, IIP. earliest); SEG 22,335 (Olympia, IIP.); SEG 25.10 (nr. Salamis, Cyprus, IP.); EG 100 (Athens, I fere p.), 474 (Sparta, II fere s.), 522 (Rome, I fere s.), 538 (nr. Theudisia, II fere s.; since name appears above boy's figure I take verse as applying to him), 617 (Rome, II); GEB 147 (Philippi); GG 136 (Chersonesus, ex. Ia.), 154 (Salamis, Cyprus, aet. Ptol. Philom.), 157 (Chios, IIa.), 460 (Panticapaeum, II/I); here, too, belongs most of the documentation in L. Robert, *Hellenica* 13, pp. 45—53, since most of his examples are students. But he also studies cultural values and their diffusion.

<sup>186</sup> In the words of GG 395, l. 9 (Bithynia, IIP.).

<sup>187</sup> GG189, ll. 5—6 (Ca. 200 B. C.). Cited and commented by Boyancé, pp. 278—9. Cf. the Orphic hymn to the Muses, where they are called θρέπτειραι ψυχῆς (1.5) cited ib. p. 280, n. 1.

<sup>188</sup> SEG 2.482 (Kertsch, IV/III) = GVI 101 = IRB 118, diff. rests. do not alter case.

<sup>189</sup> On Sappho, Müller-Graupa, s.v. Μουσεῖον 1), RE 16.1, col. 798, ll. 36—42.

<sup>190</sup> LSJ, s.h.v.

<sup>191</sup> FGrHist 334F36; but cf. caueat, ap. Otto Jahn — Adolph Michaelis, *Sophoclis 'Electra'* (Bonn, 1882), app. crit. p. 6: ταῖς... συναγαγεῖν *uerba Iahnus apud Luedersium (die dionys. Künstler p. 53) ex epigrammate sumpta suspicatur.* Mayer, RE 16.1, col. 693, ll. 21—24, cites this passage and compares Maass *Aratea* 319.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. Müller-Graupa, col. 799, l. 48 — col. 801, l. 4; Boyancé pp. 261—6.

<sup>193</sup> Müller-Graupa, 801, ll. 6—55; Boyancé pp. 299—319.

<sup>194</sup> Mayer, 702, ll. 16—19; 704, ll. 25—27; 738, ll. 3—14; from Pausanias 1.2.5. The house was later consecrated to Dionysus Melpomenos.

<sup>195</sup> IG 12.3, 300 (ex. III/in. II); Mayer, 704, l. 23, says IIa; cf. Boyancé 330—6.

shrine, with hereditary priesthood vested in the founder's family.<sup>196</sup> Although Epiphania does not mention it, one might speculate on the possibility that her Athenian mother belonged to such a *θίασος*, which might then have had a major influence upon the child. One might also speculate on the possibility that Epiphania hoped to share in wisdom, that property of divine beings, not only here but hereafter; and that she looked to the Muses for aid in heaven as on earth<sup>197</sup>. But on all things beyond this life, both she and her husband are absolutely silent.

Of course, 'pagan', like 'Jew' and 'Christian', describes many kinds of people; and the overall identification is less meaningful than the particular tone of the words. Ll. 15–19 might be the pagan equivalent of what in the nineteenth century was called 'high thinking'; and ll. 17–19 are part of a social gospel. Also to be noted are the lack of otherworldliness and the complete freedom from superstition, expressed in curses or in any other way.

At the risk of defacing the monument with translationese, I have adhered to the Greek as closely as I could for the rendition below:

"Greetings, traveler." — "And to you." — "You stopped, on reflection, saying, 'Now, who, and of what origin, is this woman?' Hear, then, visitor, my native country and my name. My land, some time ago, was Greece: I was born of an Athenian mother and a father from Hermione. Much have I seen of the world; and all of the sea have I sailed. For my father and husband were shipmasters — whom I laid to rest, with hands devoted, in the tomb, when they had died. Blessed was my life, of former days. Among the Muses I was bred, and in wisdom I have shared. And to helpmates bereaved and destitute, as a woman to women, I gave much aid, out of regard for piety. . . ." — "Yes; and having undergone much suffering as an invalid, she knew well: not in the measure of their piety are the fates of mortals. Hermogenes, citizen of Ancyra and Tomi,<sup>198</sup> member of the Oinopes tribe, to his own wife, gratefully, *in memoriam* — I set this up."

The inscription must now be dated. This task is formidable. The earliest reports, from 'Αθηνᾶ and AEM, say nothing of the "archaeological context".<sup>199</sup> The words have no mention of historical events or

<sup>196</sup> D. M. Pippidi, *Sc. Min.*, p. 102 w. n. 38, citing StCl. VIII, 1966, pp. 240–2.

<sup>197</sup> Boyancé, p. 233, n. 5, citing Arist. *Rhet.* 1389b, pp. 249–257, 274–5, 284–290. Marrou pp. 231–250, w. refs. to Boyancé and Cumont. But cf. the caveats of Marrou, pp. 253–4, and postface p. 318, citing A.D. Nock, *AJA* 50, 1946, 140–170. It may be noted — since Epiphania, by preparing her own epitaph, takes her place in a tradition at least as old as Aeschylus — that some of the best-known examples of this tradition — e.g., the epitaph of Aeschylus himself — are also silent on the question of personal immortality.

<sup>198</sup> On dual citizenship, cf. e.g.: IG 2/3<sup>2</sup>, 11169, ll. 9–10 (post 346/5), IG 12.5, 307, ll. 7–8 (Paros, Ip. earliest); IBM 177, ll. 3–5 (Tomi); AEM 8, 1884, p. 23f. No 62, ll. 2–3 (lb.); GVI 1016, ll. 1–2 (Cotiaeum, I/II); *Glad.* 90, ll. 10–20.

<sup>199</sup> Woodhead, p. 54.

persons; the *res priuatae* are such as could be found over several centuries of antiquity.

One turns then to the guides on the stone; but for these, wide tolerances are given. "L'emploi des lettres monumentales sur ... les architraves", which could have influenced the placing of l. 1 here, "date de l'époque alexandrine"<sup>200</sup>. The change  $\tau > \epsilon$  begins to appear "dans les inscriptions attiques (dans la langue vulgaire) ... au III<sup>e</sup> siècle déjà avant notre ère"<sup>201</sup>. By the first century B.C., this change appears in official epigraphy with its best foot forward<sup>202</sup>. At the latter time, too, *iota* "subscript" was being remarked for its absence<sup>203</sup>.

As to the site, "à Tomis ... les inscriptions d'époque ... hellénistique manquent à peu près complètement, mais ... les documents d'époque romaine sont extrêmement nombreux, allant du I<sup>er</sup> au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère..."<sup>204</sup>.

Reverting specifically to letter-forms, one finds that "Π took the place of Γ ... in the course of the first centuries B. C. and A. D.;"<sup>205</sup> and that "in the Roman period, there may be noted a growing fondness ... for rounded letters (ΕΜCΩ), based on forms used in the cursive script; ... [which] were sometimes adapted to the more intractable medium of the stone-cut inscription in a squared form, such as C and W"<sup>206</sup>.

Admittedly, "the only safe way to undertake ... the dating of a stone on the basis of its lettering is to have a thorough and constantly maintained acquaintance with the comparative material. ... Experience is essential, and must in particular be based on the site from which the inscription comes and the lettering-forms in other texts from the same ... area." However, "a ... student who is not ... a specialist in epigraphy may well ... accept what the 'professional' epigraphist has [said] ..., and ... is generally justified in so doing"<sup>207</sup>.

Stoian compares the letter-forms of this inscription to those of BCH 40 (1936), p. 47 f. No 3, citing the discussion on p. 49.<sup>208</sup> On p. 50, that inscription is shown to be datable at 262/3 or 381 A.D.

Lambrino, commenting on AEM 17 (1894), p. 88 No 12, remarks "d'après la forme des lettres (Θ en forme de losange, Σ rectangulaire), [l'inscription] doit se placer à l'époque des Sévères"<sup>209</sup>.

<sup>200</sup> S. Reinach, *Traité d'Épigraphie*, pp. 206—7, w. ref. ad loc.

<sup>201</sup> Mihailov, *La Langue*, p. 31.

<sup>202</sup> E. g.: CIG 2335 (Aphrodisias, relat. w. Marc Antony).

<sup>203</sup> Reinach, p. 206, cites Strabo 14.648.

<sup>204</sup> D. M. Pippidi, *Les inscriptions grecques de Scythie Mineure de Bocckh à nos jours* *Akte des IV. internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik* (Vienna, 1964), p. 327.

<sup>205</sup> Woodhead, p. 64.

<sup>206</sup> *Ib.*, p. 65.

<sup>207</sup> *Ib.*, p. 52, single quotes in original.

<sup>208</sup> *Tomitana*, p. 66, n. 2 & StCl. 3, p. 188, n. 6.

<sup>209</sup> Istros, 1, 1934, p. 117.

Pippidi, on SEG 1, 329, observes "der ... Text ... unter den Severen eingemeisselt worden ist. Dafür sprechen ... die zahlreichen Ligaturen (durchaus ungewöhnlich in der ersten Hälfte des 2. Jh.) ... [und] auch die Form der Buchstaben Y (mit Querstrich), C (rechteckig), Ω (wie ein W gebildet), die für die Urkunden Histrias aus der Zeit des Caracalla und seiner Nachfolger charakteristisch sind."<sup>210</sup>

These are the most detailed and precise commentaries that I have been able to find. Although they deal with "material ... from the same area" but not "from the same place",<sup>211</sup> I believe there is sufficient common ground to justify their application here. I therefore concur with the opinion setting this memorial in the II/III centuries A.D.<sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup> *Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte Histrias in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin: Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft No 34 (1962), p. 138.

<sup>211</sup> Woodhead, p. 65.

<sup>212</sup> This paper is an outgrowth of one submitted to Professor William M. Calder III; and owes much to the advice and encouragement of Professor D. M. Pippidi. Both scholars have read my manuscript to my great benefit.



Fig. 1

# ΧΑΙΡΕΓΙΑΡΟΔΕΙΤΑ·ΚΑΙΛΥ

5 ΕΣΤΗΚΕΛΕΙΤΕΝΝΟΙΑΛΕΓΩ  
 ΑΡΑΤΙΣΗΠΟΘΕΝ·ΗΔΕΑΚΟΥ  
 ΕΔΗΣΕΙΝΕΤΤΑΤΡΑΝΚΑΙΟΥ  
 ΝΟΜΑΤΟΥΜΟΝ·ΗΝΜΕΝΜΟΙ  
 ΧΩΝΤΟΓΡΙΝΕΛΛΕΚΜΗ  
 ΤΡΟΣΑΘΗΝΛΙΑΣ·ΕΦΥΗΝΤΑ  
 ΤΡΟΣΤΕΕΡΜΙΟΝΕΟΣΕΠΙΦΑ  
 ΝΙΑΔΕΜΟΙΟΥΝΟΜΑ·ΠΟΛΛΗ  
 10 ΜΕΝΕΣΕΙΔΟΝΕΓΩΑΙΑΝΤΑΣΑΝ  
 ΤΕΕΠΛΕΥΣΑΘΑΛΑΤΤΑΝΩ  
 ΗΝΑΡΕΜΟΙΓΕΝΕΤΗΣΚΑΙΓΑΜΕΤΗΣ  
 ΝΑΥΚΛΗΡΟΙΟΥΣΕΘΕΜΗΝ Ω  
 ΠΑΛΑΜΕΣΙΝΑΙΪΑΙΣΥΠΟΤΥΝΒΩ  
 15 ΘΑΝΟΝΤΑΣΟΑΒΙΟΣΔΕΜΟΙΒΙΟΣ  
 ΤΟΤΡΙΝΗΝΕΜΟΥΣΕΣΕΦΥΗΣΟΦΙ  
 ΗΤΕΜΕΤΕΣΧΟΝ·ΦΙΛΕΣΤΕΛΕΙΤ  
 ΜΕΝΕΣΩΣΓΥΝΗΓΥΝΗΣΙΠΟΛΛΑΠΑ  
 ΡΕΣΧΟΝ·ΕΙΣΕΥΣΕΒΙΗΝΑΦΟΡΩΣ/  
 20 ΚΑΙΔΗΚΛΕΙΝΡΗΚΑΜΑΤΟΝΤΟΛΥΝΕ  
 ΝΕΝΚΑΜΕΝ·ΕΓΝΩΣΑΦΩΣ·ΟΥΚΑΤΕ  
 ΣΕΒΙΑΝΕΙΣΙΝΑΙΘΗΤΩΝΤΥΧΑΙ  
 ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ·ΑΝΚΥΡΑΝΟΣΚΑΙΤΟΜΙΤΗΖ  
 25 ΦΙΛΗΣΟΙΝΩΝ·ΤΗΑΥΤΟΥΣΥΝΒΙΗ  
 ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΩΜΕ'ΑΣΧΑΡΙΝΑΝΕΘΗΚΑ

1:7

Fig. 2