

Watson derived this from Common Celtic \**Uoritia* ‘slow-running one’, which later writers in part accept.<sup>24</sup> Yet there seems a simpler solution. The Welsh knew the Forth as *Gweryd*, the exact cognate of *Forth*. *Gweryd* is also a common noun meaning ‘earth, soil, mould, humus, sward, land; clod, sod’, while Old Breton *gueretreou* ‘lands of humus’ glosses *sirtium* ‘of sandbanks, of quicksands’. In this context *Gweryd* makes sense as the original name of Flanders Moss, made up of spongy earthy humus. If so, a regional name would have become a river-name, much as *Liffey*, originally meaning the plain west of Dublin, became used of its main river.<sup>25</sup> This explanation accords with references in early Celtic sources.<sup>26</sup>

University of Navarre, Pamplona

ANDREW BREEZE

abreeze@unav.es

doi:10.1017/S0009838807000394

<sup>24</sup> Watson (n. 5), 52–4; T. F. O’Rahilly, *Early Irish History and Mythology* (Dublin, 1946), 528–9; Rivet and Smith (n. 1), 270.

<sup>25</sup> F. J. Byrne, *Irish Kings and High-Kings* (London, 1973), 150.

<sup>26</sup> Watson (n. 5), 52–4; I. Williams (ed.), *Armes Prydein* (Dublin, 1972), 67; M. O. Anderson, *Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1973), 146, 242; J. Bannerman, *Studies in the History of Dalriada* (Edinburgh, 1974), 85; R. Bromwich (ed.), *Trioedd Ynys Prydein* (Cardiff, 1978<sup>2</sup>), 501.

## A FORGOTTEN SOPHIST

An inscription from Lindus on Rhodes, published by C. Blinkenberg in 1942, has the following text (to which I have added accents, breathings and punctuation):<sup>1</sup>

Λίνδιοι καὶ οἱ μάσ[τρ]οι  
 Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Αντίπατρον  
 [Μνασ]αγόρα Πάγιον, τὸν ἱερέα τᾶς Α[ιδίας]  
 [Ἀθα]νᾶς καὶ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Πολιέως καὶ Ἰ[Αρτά-] 4  
 [μι]τος Κεκοίας, τριηραρχήσαντα, ἱερατεύσα[ντα]  
 τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων, γυμνασιάρχῆσαντα, ποιη[σάμε-]  
 νον τὰν θέσιν τοῦ ἐλαίου ἐπὶ μῆνας δεκατρεῖς, ἀ[γω-]  
 νοθετήσαντα τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Ἀλιέων ἀγῶνος, ταμ[ι-] 8  
 εύσαντα, πρυτανεύσαντα καὶ πρεσβεύσαντα, τειμα-  
 θέντα τρεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ δάμου τοῦ Ῥοδίων καὶ τοῦ Λινδίων,  
 ἐν προεισφόραις καὶ ἐπιδόσεσιν π<λ>είουσιν γενόμενον,  
 χοραγῆσαντα δῖς, ἱερωνήσαντα, ἱερατεύσαντα τῶν 12  
 μυστηρίων τοῦ Βάκχου Διούσου, κατασκενάσαν-  
 τα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἐν τᾷ πόλει  
 μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Κλαυδίου Διοκλεῖδα κατερε[ι-]  
 φθὲν ἐν τῷ σεισμῷ, καὶ πολιτευσάμενον τ[ᾷ] 16

<sup>1</sup> I have used the following abbreviations: Blinkenberg = C. Blinkenberg (ed.), *Lindos: fouilles et recherches, 1902–1914: Inscriptions* (Berlin–Copenhagen, 1941); *Bull. ép.* = ‘Bulletin épigraphique’, appearing annually in *REG*, cited by year and number of item; Morelli = D. Morelli, *I Cultii in Rodi*, *SCO* 8 (1959); Puech = B. Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les Inscriptions d’époque impériale* (Paris, 2002); Robert, *OMS* = L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta* (Amsterdam, 1969–90). Inscription: *I. Lindos* no. 449. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* (1942), 115 (p. 348), commented on the inscription and noted τὸν σοφιστὴν in line 18; cf. also L. Robert, *Documents d’Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1987), 99–100 (*BCH* 1978). I am grateful to Glen Bowersock for his advice.

συμφορώτατα τῇ πατρίδι, διενέγκαντα δὲ κ[αί]  
 ἐν παιδείᾳ τῶν Ἑλλάνων, τὸν σοφιστ[ᾶν]  
 καὶ [ ]ον κ[ ]ΟΝ καὶ ἑρέα Σεράπιδος[s.]

11: ΠΑΕΙΟΣΙΝ the stone. 19: this was added subsequently to the main text and just above the lower edge, which is preserved: very few of the letters reported by Bl. are visible on the photograph.

To take some details first, the inscription is on a statue-base set up by the citizens of Lindus and their councillors (*mastroi*) in honour of T. Claudius Antipater, of the deme Pagus, and the aorist participles suggest that it is posthumous. His nomenclature (lines 2–3) indicates that his father Mnasagoras was a *peregrinus*, while he and his son were both Claudii. Antipater could have gained the citizenship from Claudius, in whose reign the Roman citizenship first appears massively in Rhodes (the emperor deprived the island of its freedom in 44, but restored it in 53; for further vicissitudes, see below); the donor might also be Nero, given his well-known affection for the island. Blinkenberg dated the inscription about 100 C.E., and plausibly placed the honorand in the stemma of a family that goes from the first century C.E. down to the third.<sup>2</sup>

The first offices mentioned are the three chief priesthoods of the city, Lindian Athena, Zeus Polieus and Artemis Kekoia (lines 3–5). The third of these, sometimes called ‘Artemis in Kekoia’, takes her name from a sanctuary on the city’s territory.<sup>3</sup> Other of Antipater’s magistracies and liturgies benefited the whole Rhodian community, such as his presidency of the great contest of the Heliæa, the chief festival of the island (lines 7–8). As a reward he was thrice ‘honoured’ by both Lindus and the city of Rhodes, presumably by the erection of statues, a frequent meaning of *timê* (lines 8–9).

The two religious offices mentioned in lines 12–13 are notable. *ἑρωνήσαντα* is a *hapax*, though the noun *ἑρώνας* is attested in Hellenistic treaties made by Rhodes with Eresus and with Hierapytna. The sense is clearly ‘purchaser of sacrificial victims’, and is so understood in the Supplement to Liddell and Scott. Dionysus is frequent in inscriptions of Rhodes, sometimes with the double name ‘Bacchus Dionysus’, though this seems to be the only one to refer to his mysteries. It is well known that the imperial period saw an explosion of Dionysiac mysteries.<sup>4</sup>

Lines 13–16 state that Antipater ‘repaired at his own expense the sanctuary of Asclepius in the city with his son Claudius Diocleidas when it had been ruined in the earthquake’; *κατασκευάζειν* more often means ‘construct’, as opposed to *ἐπισκευάζειν* meaning ‘repair’, though it can have the latter sense too.<sup>5</sup> The phrase ‘in the city’ must indicate Rhodes, the main city of the island: a Lindian inscription, very similar to the present one in date and in content, distinguishes between Rhodes as ‘the

<sup>2</sup> Roman names on Rhodes: A. Bresson, ‘L’onomastique romaine à Rhodes’, in A. D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East*, Meletemata 21 (Athens, 1996), 228–32. Stemma: Blinkenberg 31, stemma 2.

<sup>3</sup> For Zeus Polieus and Athena Lindia at Lindus, Blinkenberg 102–3, Morelli 145; for Artemis Kekoia, Morelli 114–15.

<sup>4</sup> *ἑρώνας*: L. Robert, ‘Inscriptions d’Athènes et de la Grèce centrale’, *OMS* 7.731 (*Arch. Eph.* 1969), citing *IG* 12 suppl. 120, 13 (Eresus), *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 581, 91 (Hierapytna). Dionysus on Rhodes: Morelli, 122–6. Dionysiac mysteries: M. P. Nilsson, *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age* (Lund, 1957), 45–66; id., *GGR* 23.358–72.

<sup>5</sup> For *κατασκευάζειν* as ‘repair’ see P. Gauthier, ‘Bienfaiteurs du Gymnase au Létôon de Xanthos’, *REG* 109 (1996), 15.

common city' (ἡ κοινὰ πόλις) and 'the Lindians'. Moreover, there is no evidence for a sanctuary of Asclepius in Lindus, whereas the city of Rhodes had a famous one, of which the exact site became known in 1997.<sup>6</sup> Given the seismicity of the Aegean area, an otherwise unattested earthquake is not surprising, though it is possible that this same one is meant in another inscription of Lindus. Here a certain T. Flavius Damagoras, son of Damagoras, and his son with the same *tria nomina* make a dedication to Helios 'after the earthquake'. As in the inscription of Antipater, the grandfather is a peregrine and the son and grandson are citizens. From the letter-forms, however, Blinkenberg judged that this was the well-known earthquake of about 140.<sup>7</sup>

Antipater had 'conducted himself in politics in a way most advantageous for the city, and was also distinguished among the Greeks for his culture' (lines 16–18). This sense of πολιτεύομαι is frequent in the imperial period, as also is that of διαφέρω.<sup>8</sup> The phrase διενέγκαντα ἐν παιδείᾳ τῶν Ἑλλάνων resembles expressions in imperial-period literature such as παῖδα ... πεντεκαίδεκέτη μὲν σχεδόν, πολὺ δὲ ῥώμῃ καὶ μεγέθει διαφέροντα τῶν ὀμηλίκων (Plut. *De genio Socr.* 595B), φύσει τε καὶ παιδείᾳ τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρων (Dio Cass. 72.6.1); these parallels appear to rule out the translation 'outstanding in Greek culture', which might require Ἑλληνικῇ. The proud qualification 'among Greeks' similarly recalls the way in which literature of this same period uses 'the Greeks' to designate all those prominent in Greek culture: thus the Corinthians honoured Favorinus with a statue as 'the best of Greeks' (ἄριστος Ἑλλήνων).<sup>9</sup>

Of Antipater Blinkenberg rightly observes, 'D'après les termes de l'inscription, on aurait pu s'attendre à ce qu'Antipatros fût mentionné dans la littérature.' As it happens, probably because the inscription was only published during the Second World War, Antipater has also failed to find his place in the now abundant literature of the Second Sophistic. He is absent from Bernadette Puech's excellent catalogue of sophists in epigraphy, and a recent survey of Rhodian culture both classifies him as a *grammatikos* and appears to translate σοφιστής as 'most wise'.<sup>10</sup> Rather, he is a perfect example of the combination of sophistic and public activity delineated by G. W. Bowersock in his *Greek Sophists*.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, this inscription appears to be the

<sup>6</sup> Inscription: C. Habicht, 'Ein kaiserzeitliches Familiendenkmal aus Lindos', *ZPE* 84 (1990), 113–20 (*SEG* 40, 668). Asclepieion of Rhodes: Diod. Sic. 19.45.4 (E. J. and L. Edelstein, *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies* 2 [Baltimore, 1945], 401 T 793); in general, Morelli 31–3, 115–17 (I have not seen the discussion of I. D. Kondis reported in *Bull. ép.* 1958, 361). Excavation: *Archaeological Reports for 1998–1999* (1999), 109; G. Touchais, 'Chronique de fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1996 et 1997', *BCH* 122 (1998), 941; id., 'Chronique de fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1998', *BCH* 123 (1999), 807; G. Touchais, S. Huber and A. Philipp-Touchais, 'Chronique de fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1999', *BCH* 124 (2000), 984.

<sup>7</sup> Inscription: *IG* 12.1.23 (*IGR* 4.1121); Blinkenberg, 866; cf. Robert, *Documents* (n. 1), 95. Earthquake of c. 140: C. P. Jones, 'The Rhodian oration ascribed to Aelius Aristides', *CQ* 40 (1990) 514–15.

<sup>8</sup> πολιτεύομαι: A. Wilhelm, 'Zum griechischen Wortschatz', *Glotta* 14 (1925), 78–82 = *Abhandlungen und Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* 4 (Vienna, 2002), 180–4; *Bull. ép.* 1958, 79. διαφέρω: L. Robert, 'Études d'épigraphie grecque', *OMS* 2.1059 (*RPhil* 1927); *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris, 1938), 27, n. 6; id., 'Recherches épigraphiques', *OMS* 2.847 n. 1 (*REA* 1960). Examples with ἐν are rare, but include Isocr. 3.39.

<sup>9</sup> [Dio Chrys.] 37.22. Philostratus uses 'the Greeks' similarly, e.g. *VS* 2.27.6, 618 Ol. (Hippodromus of Thessaly).

<sup>10</sup> B. Mygind, 'Intellectuals in Rhodes', in V. Gabrielsen (ed.), *Hellenistic Rhodes* (Aarhus, 1999), 266 no. 43.

<sup>11</sup> G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969); contrast E. L. Bowie, 'The importance of sophists', *YCIS* 27 (1982), 29–59; neither mentions Antipater.

earliest among the many that honour sophists, since otherwise there is none for the earliest among Philostratus' second wave of sophists, Nicetes, Scopelian, Isaeus, though curiously there are for philosophers contemporary with them, such as Plutarch, Euphrates, and Epictetus.<sup>12</sup>

Philostratus' failure to mention Antipater might suggest that he enjoyed merely a local renown. But the chronicler of the Second Sophistic is highly selective in his catalogue of sophists, and has several notable omissions for which the motive is not always clear: for example, Euphrates of Tyre, so prominent in the *Life of Apollonius*, could surely have stood beside Dio and Favorinus as a sophist who appeared to be a philosopher. In the present instance, Philostratus' concentration on Athens and Smyrna is perhaps the explanation. He mentions that Aeschines had opened a school of rhetoric on Rhodes, but he omits the island completely from his account of the Second Sophistic. Apart from Antipater, another Rhodian sophist is absent from his catalogue, Titus Aurelianus Nicostratus who received a chair (presumably in Rome) from 'the greatest emperor' (presumably Marcus or Commodus) and like Euhodanus of Smyrna in Philostratus was made governor of the Guild of Dionysiac Artists. Two Rhodians also head the list of students who honoured a certain Soterus at Ephesus, a sophist whom Philostratus dismisses as a 'toy of the Greeks' (*ἄθυρμα τῶν Ἑλλήνων*); one of these, Flavius Hypsicles, is also named in inscriptions of Lindus.<sup>13</sup>

If the present inscription belongs about 100, then it has a further interest. Vespasian took away the freedom granted by Claudius, but Titus or more probably Domitian restored it. There was, however, political unrest on the island in Domitian's reign, since Plutarch, writing not long afterwards, cites Rhodes as an example of how the true statesman will not sit cowering in times of trouble, but will use outspokenness (*parrhêsia*) to bring it to an end. In addition, a large base from Thyassys in the Rhodian Peraea held statues of Domitian and Domitia, who is honoured as *thea Sebastâ Homonoia*: the donor is one Jason son of Aristogenes, *hégemon* in the region, 'during whose term the ancestral constitution was restored' (*ἐφ' οὗ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ πάτριος πολιτεία*).<sup>14</sup> Plutarch perhaps knew that Rhodian ambassadors had managed to avert the emperor's displeasure, and it might be wondered if the sophist Antipater had been one of them. The present text merely says that he had gone 'as an ambassador' without specifying where or why, and though that vagueness has parallels, it would be all the more understandable if Antipater had obtained some favour from Domitian.

Harvard University

CHRISTOPHER P. JONES

cjones@fas.harvard.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838807000407

<sup>12</sup> Plutarch: *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 844 A, B. Euphrates: C. P. Jones, 'Epigraphica VII: Euphrates of Tyre', *ZPE* 144 (2003), 160–2. Epictetus: *IG* 4<sup>2</sup>.683 (cf. *Bull. ép.* 1958, p. 198).

<sup>13</sup> Nicostratus: *IG* 12.1.83 (*IGR* 4.1134); Puech, 367–9, nos. 187–88. Puech rightly disjoins him from the Macedonian sophist Nicostratus who receives a glancing mention in Philostratus, though the two are often identified (*VS* 2.31.1, 624 Ol.; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1427). Euhodanus: Philostr. *VS* 2.16, p. 596 Ol. Hypsicles: *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 881 (now *I. Ephesos* 3.673).

<sup>14</sup> Vespasian: Suet. *Vesp.* 8.4. Plut. *Prae. ger. reip.* 815 D. Inscription: *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 819; A. D. Momigliano, review of C. Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea*, *JRS* 41 (1951) 150–1 (*Quinto Contributo* [Rome, 1975], 967–71), whose reconstruction of events I follow.