

## DOCUMENTS FROM KOURION: A REVIEW ARTICLE

ROGER S. BAGNALL AND THOMAS DREW-BEAR

### PART 2: INDIVIDUAL INSCRIPTIONS

**5** Lack of an apparatus to this syllabic text leads to misrepresentation of the contributions of another scholar. The editor comments, "In sign 2, where the editors find  $\uparrow$ , the upright is in fact wanting, since the deep, angled mark below and to the right is without doubt casual." But Masson (independently of Mitford's first edition of this text) has a drawing of the text in which the middle mark is shaded, which by his normal practice indicates marks that do not belong to the sign. Masson's comment (p. 195): "Le signe 2, ordinairement lu *ti*, est un *u* en forme de  $\wedge$  comme on en trouve à Rantidhi, par exemple 30, 1." Mitford, on the other hand, says as if alone in the view, "Here I have little hesitation in seeing the archaic Paphian *u*, the only form to occur in the Kouklia siege mound and at Rantidi." The two scholars thus reached this conclusion independently.

**13** In the interpretation of this syllabic inscription Mitford maintains his improbable explanation of his reading *i-po-sa* as an aorist  $\iota\phi\omega\sigma\alpha$  for  $\xi\phi\omega\sigma\alpha$ , interpreted as an example of a supposed Cypriot augment with iota in place of epsilon,<sup>1</sup> although O. Masson has stated that "la forme verbale supposée, pour  $\xi\phi\omega\sigma\alpha$ , de  $\phi\phi\zeta\omega$  (qui signifie 'faire rôtir, griller') est inacceptable";<sup>2</sup> and in the work here reviewed Mitford does not indicate that in his first publication of this document<sup>3</sup> he wrote  $\text{'}\text{Ο}\text{νασιμῆς}$  (an "abbreviation for Onasimedes") which is now changed to  $\text{'}\text{Ο}\text{νασιμῆς}$  under the influence of Masson, who read  $\text{'}\text{Ο}\text{νασιμᾶς}$ , hypocoristic of  $\text{'}\text{Ο}\text{νασιμῆνης}$ . Neither of the two previous editions of this document, by Mitford himself and by Masson, is registered in the Concordance (397–398), nor does the Concordance list the reproduction of this text in *SEG* 20 (1964) 166.

**18** In the edition of this "statuette of a temple boy," the lack of an

<sup>1</sup>Curiously, this interpretation was accepted by the editors of the recent *Supplement to LSJ*, who neglect to inform their readers that the text in question is not alphabetic but syllabic.

<sup>2</sup>*BCH* 85 (1961) 574; cf. the same scholar's *Inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques* (Paris 1961) 398.

<sup>3</sup>*BICS* Suppl. 10 (1961) 22–23 no. 17. Here Mitford dated this text to the seventh century B.C. (the date registered in the *Supplement to LSJ*); but on p. 35 of the present work he expresses gratitude to J. L. Benson "for his confident dating of the pot to the sixth century."

apparatus makes it possible to avoid discussing the question of justification of the readings, which differ from those of the editor's predecessors in the first sign. Since Mitford's restoration ("attractive, if somewhat hazardous") depends on the reading of the first sign, a discussion of this point would have been in order.

19 In commenting on this statuette, the editor remarks, "Masson is content to suggest . . . *λιος ὁ πατήρ* for signs 3 to 8." But he does not give the essential information that Masson (p. 198, no. 184) considered these signs to be the last signs of the text rather than the first. Once again, Masson was not "content" with the reading he offers, for it is prefaced with the remark, "la suite est obscure, à la fin peut-être . . . *λιος ὁ πατήρ*."

26 In the alphabetic text of this inscription (which has both alphabetic and syllabic texts) the last word is given as *ἀνέθηκεν*, even though the photograph shows clearly that the terminal nu is not now on the inscription and never was, as the stone is undamaged in this place.

31 This fragment of an honorific decree of the third century B.C., very similar to that published in 1938 from an unknown Cypriot city,<sup>4</sup> grants freedom from taxes in exporting and importing into Kourion, among other privileges. The editor (p. 74) concludes from this that "we may presume that the honorand of our decree was a subject of the Ptolemaic empire; for it is not easy to see how this grant of free trade to an alien could square with the close economic imperialism of the Ptolemies." The nature of Ptolemaic economic policy is here misconceived. The city can have granted exemption only from its own taxes, so that the crown's treatment of a person would not be affected by any civic decree. The royal "economic imperialism" is therefore irrelevant. In addition, the Revenue Laws and other documents show clearly that free trade did not exist within the Ptolemaic possessions any more than between them and the "exterior." The formula of this inscription, banal as it is, does not indicate anything about the origin of the person honored.<sup>5</sup>

32 The restoration of this decree of Kourion is in large part to be rejected; we will discuss the problems of this text in *Chronique d'Égypte*.

34 In this honorific decree only the right-hand side, said to be something less than half the original, survives. Mitford restores in full 19 out of 28 lines,<sup>6</sup> with this commentary: "These supplements I offer in the

<sup>4</sup>T. B. Mitford, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 13 (1938) 18, no. 6. For the restoration and explanation of this text see J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1939, 528, and G. Klaffenbach, *Archiv* 13 (1939) 212-213.

<sup>5</sup>On the exemption from taxes granted by a subject city, see the discussions of J. and L. Robert in *Bull. épigr.* 1971, 622 and in *La Carie* 2 (Paris 1954) 298.

<sup>6</sup>We discuss above (p. 112) the lack of an apparatus to this text. The proposed restora-

main *exempli gratia*; but that they give the general sense of the inscription, I do not doubt" (p. 81). Not a single parallel for any of the phrases restored, not a single argument to support the grammatical constructions that are proposed. This procedure is simply inadmissible; an editor must defend on the basis of parallels both his restorations and in general his interpretation of the sense of the inscription, which should depend entirely on the remaining words (which are not discussed in this edition).

41 This Hellenistic statue base is presented by the editor as follows:<sup>7</sup>

[Ἀπόλλωνι υἱοῦ Πυθίῳ] καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι υἱοῦ Ἰλ[άτῃ]  
 [οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν Ἀπόλλωνος Ἰλάτου] καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθίου καὶ Ἡ[ρας Ἀργείας  
 [τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνα τὸν στρατηγόν] Κύπρου ὁ καὶ Ἀριστίαν τὸν ἀφ[ελφόν  
 αὐ]τοῦ  
 [- - office - - εὐνοίας ἔνεκεν κα]ὶ ἀγνείας τῆς εἰς αὐτούς. 4

The phraseology of the restoration of line 2 is very odd. The priests were, surely, priests of the god, not priests of his sanctuary. And some external considerations also suggest that the restoration is unsatisfactory: although the editor claims that the epithet Ἀργείας "exactly fills the lacuna" toward the end of the line, the number of letters lost is in fact about ten, if one compares this space to the comparable space in line 3; there are, however, 13 letters restored in line 2. As to the eta of Ἡ[ρας], it is not visible on the photograph; although the small size and poor quality of the photograph make it impossible to ascertain the correct reading, it does not appear that anything of the eta is present on the stone. We suggest that a more likely restoration is [οἱ ἱερεῖς Ἀπόλλωνος Ἰλάτου] καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθίου καὶ [τῶν ἄλλων θε]ῶν.

Of the restoration of line 3, Mitford says "the first honorand was without doubt *strategos* of the island." It is hard to see why this conclusion is necessary, for other positions—oikonomos, for instance—might have been mentioned. Titles are rare in third-century inscriptions of Cyprus, and we know little of the exact state of the royal bureaucracy at this time. The restoration of the title is thus gratuitous.<sup>8</sup>

"Aristias, the brother, also (it is clear) held some official position in the

---

tions are in fact surely wrong, notably in the opening lines; for instance among the offices held by the honorand is proposed [e.g., ἀγωνοθέτης], although this function is nowhere attested in the inscriptions of Kourion: on p. 187 Mitford correctly remarks that "of games and ἀγωνοθέται [he accents ἀγωνόθεται] we have as yet heard nothing."

<sup>7</sup>A misprint in the text of 41 has removed the first two words of line 2 to line 5 of 43 (p. 95).

<sup>8</sup>The use of Κύπρου instead of τῆς νήσου is in itself odd, for the latter is by a wide margin the normal term in Cypriot inscriptions honoring Ptolemaic strategoi; *IKourion* 45 is one example. We do not see what P. Roesch, *BCH* 95 (1971) 577, n. 13, finds "insolite" about the use of ἡ νήσος to designate Cyprus.

island; and we may reasonably conjecture that he was ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως (cf. no. 42 below) of Kourion." This interpretation of line 4 is anything but clear. Line 4 ends well before the end of lines 3 and 2 at the right, and the putative arrangement of line 1 shows that centering of lines is a possibility to be reckoned with. It is therefore entirely possible that the first part of line 4 was vacant and that no title was given to Aristias in this inscription.

**42** This text will be discussed by Chr. Habicht in the *Festschrift* for M. Guarducci.

**44** To constitute the text of this inscription the editor has associated four fragments.<sup>9</sup> We have mentioned above (p. 109) that one of them (fragment *c*) is possibly not a part of this inscription, and such calculations as can be made about the letter size seem to encourage skepticism.<sup>10</sup> The text is presented as follows:

Ἀνδ[ρόμαχο]ν ? Ν[- - -]  
 τῶν [πρώτ]ων φίλων, [- - τῶν]  
 [κατὰ τὴν] νῆσον καὶ ἀ[πὸ τῆς - -]ης  
 4 [Κουρίων ἢ πό]λις εὐερ[γείας ἔνεκα]

Of this, the left edge of lines 1 and 2 belongs to fragment *d*, of whose association the editor is slightly doubtful. The ΗΣ at the end of line 3, however, belongs to *c*; and in line 1, although Mitford admits that other names can be restored, he uses his gratuitous restoration to draw unsupported historical conclusions. All of the titulature in line 3 is unparalleled and the restorations therefore without value. The attempt to make an office of ἀ[πὸ τῆς - -]ης is particularly feeble, since with ΗΣ dissociated the alpha could be the start of the name of a brother, wife, or child. In truth, this inscription cannot at present be restored, and the historical conclusions drawn from these restorations and this text are without basis in fact.

**49–51** On page 105 is drawn up a stemma for the members of a family attested in these inscriptions. The first of the texts is a dedication of a statue of Mentor to Apollo Hylates, set up by his sons Philinos, Mentor, and Onesilos. The third (**51**), on the other hand, is a statue set up by one of these brothers, Philinos, of his daughter Timo. There is no difficulty here. But **50** is a statue (again dedicated to Apollo Hylates) of Philotis,

<sup>9</sup>In the photograph, p. 97, they are not labelled and appear without scale. From left to right, the fragments are *d*, *b*, *a*, and *c*.

<sup>10</sup>The editor notes the "slightly rougher and larger" letter sizes of *c* as an argument against association (p. 97). Our calculations (based on the reported dimensions of the fragment) indicate that the letters of *c* are nearly 25 per cent. larger than those of the other fragments, making it unlikely that *c* is part of the larger text.

daughter of Mentor and Kleonike. There is no indication of which Mentor this was, father or son. But on the stemma, Kleonike is assigned as wife to Mentor the elder and Philotis is added as a fourth sibling to the three brothers. We can see no justification for this, for if anything the other hypothesis is more likely: Philotis would probably have joined the brothers in placing 49 if she were their sister rather than the daughter of one of them.

**55** This bronze ring, dated to the Hellenistic period by the editor on the basis of the letter forms, contains the names of four archons and a secretary. It fitted into a groove in a marble slab (220), which is identified by Mitford as the lid of the treasury of Apollo. In the bibliography one misses a reference to the article of R. Martin in *BCH* 64–65 (1940–1941) 168 ff., in which Greek *θησαυροί* are discussed with numerous examples, including some of the type found at Kourion, pages 169–170, or to M. Nilsson, *Gesch. der gr. Religion* 2<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1955) 76–77 and Pl. 1, with bibliography.

**56** This altar with the inscription Ἀρσινόης Φιλαδέλφου may conveniently be discussed with 75, a faience oinochoe with the words βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου Φιλοπάτορος. Failure to bring the book up to date after 1961 is nowhere more damaging than in this stillborn commentary, for both of these monuments belong to long-known and much-discussed classes of documents of which a satisfactory explanation was offered for the first time in 1966 by L. Robert.<sup>11</sup> Robert treats both types of documents within a general study of the evidence for voluntary private participation in the cults of cities. As these cults embodied both gratitude to the divinities and a request for future benefits, individuals would logically express their own religious feelings by acts of worship supplementary to those organized by the state. The core of Robert's discussion is a study of two documents, one a decree of Ilion, the other an Oxyrhynchus papyrus.<sup>12</sup>

The latter, from Satyros' treatise on the Demes of Alexandria, cites regulations for the procession and private sacrifices to Arsinoe Philadelphos. Both it and the inscription contain specific prescriptions about the role of individuals, such as their places in processions and animals that may not be used as sacrifices. The altar with the name of Arsinoe Philadelphos is thus explained by Robert as being a private altar of this goddess for use in a home cult. Here 56, a rough altar, has precisely the

<sup>11</sup>"Un décret d'Ilion et un papyrus concernant les cultes royaux," *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles* (American Studies in Papyrology 1 [1966]) 175–211. The altars are discussed on 202–208, the oinochoai on 208–210.

<sup>12</sup>The decree, *OGIS* 219; the papyrus, *POxy* 2465 frag. 2, Col. 1; both texts are altered and in part restored by Robert.

appearance of such a private creation.<sup>13</sup> The oinochoe, too, has its place in the domestic cult, to be used for libations.<sup>14</sup>

The commentary in *IKourion* (which nowhere refers to Robert's study), gives only other Cypriot examples and a reference to a list of these altars and plaques around the Aegaeon previously published by Mitford.<sup>15</sup> On their significance he comments, "Their meaning has indeed been much debated, but with little doubt they commemorate the deification of Arsinoe on her death in 270 B.C. (to accept the date preferred by Tarn). The genitive case is then appropriate, and we may compare the numerous rectangular altars of Kamiros . . . each inscribed simply with the name and title of a deity in this case." The key point that must be made about these altars since the article of Robert is missed, namely, that they were part of the *private* worship of Arsinoe. It is, in addition, difficult to understand the significance of "commemorate": an altar does not commemorate; it is used for sacrifices in a living cult, not as a memorial. By studying little more than Cyprus, the editor has failed to illuminate the monuments of Cyprus.

The commentary on 75 is, except for one sentence, concerned with the provenance and recent history of the object. The last sentence alone discusses the substantive question of the meaning of such jugs: "Since no queen is represented on it, presumably it is earlier than the marriage of Philopator and Arsinoe in 217 B.C."<sup>16</sup> This conclusion is without basis, for the jug served for the cult of the king, not for that of the queen, who would have had her own vessels in the domestic shrine if she was worshipped. The commentary does not, however, offer any explanation of the use of the vessel, being only concerned with its date.<sup>17</sup>

**65-66** The discussion of these two dedications to Perseutes attempts to justify the placement of these texts in the Hellenistic period:

"As for the date of nos. 65 and 66, while little confidence can be placed in the lettering as shown by Colonna-Ceccaldi and Cesnola—*alpha* with the unbroken bar at Kourion we

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Robert, *op. cit.* (above, note 11), 206 on the physical aspect of these monuments: they are either small rough stone altars or more commonly marble plaques for insertion into an altar of sand or brick.

<sup>14</sup>Robert (209): "L'oenochœ servait aux libations sur l'autel devant la maison aux jours de fête."

<sup>15</sup>It may be noted that Robert twice mentions the Kourion altar (202 n. 167, 206 n. 190) but this fact is not recorded in the lemma or commentary in *IKourion*.

<sup>16</sup>The editor does not expand on this rather dubious remark. It is by no means certain (and we believe it unlikely) that Ptolemy IV had the official epithet of Philopator before the victory of Raphia in 217; a scholar must demonstrate that fact if he wishes to make this claim about the date. The argument is in any case irrelevant because it takes no account of the purpose of the vessel.

<sup>17</sup>The editor notes (139, n. 1) that Dorothy Thompson was preparing a "special study

have found (above, nos. 43, 44) to give *ca.* 180 as *terminus ante quem*—there can be not much doubt on general grounds that we are here concerned with monuments of an early Hellenistic *temenos* which existed in late Classical times (no. 25) and doubtless (although there is no evidence for this) originated in a much earlier age, but seemingly failed to survive long under Ptolemaic rule. Many years of exploration have found no trace of a later cult; and we may conjecture that the growing power of the Apollo Sanctuary stifled such minor worships as this and that of Demeter and Kore (no. 26 above)."

This argument lacks clarity and force. If little confidence can be placed in the letter forms, why does Mitford discuss one (and only one) of them—and seemingly accept its verdict?<sup>18</sup> Without the palaeographical evidence, there is no argument for a Hellenistic date for these texts. It is unlikely that this cult was "stifled" by the Sanctuary of Apollo, and no reason can be cited why the sanctuary would have done such a thing. The editor remarks that Kourion still styled itself the city of Perseus in the Roman period (p. 128, citing 89; cf. also 104), so one would not expect that the cult of Perseutes (which was not located in or near the Sanctuary of Apollo) would be abandoned, especially if there is, as stated, a relationship between this cult and that of the *κτίστης*. The date is therefore not yet established, and the history of the cult given in the commentary is unconvincing.

76 The text and commentary, both dubious, of this decree of the Roman period, will be discussed by us at length in *Chronique d'Egypte*.

77 For this bottom left portion of a previously unpublished honorific decree a complete restoration is offered with a date of 30 B.C.–1 B.C. and the following remarks (p. 145): "these supplements are offered in the main *exempli gratia*" (a sample: [δπως ἅπαντες εἰδῶσιν] ὅτι τοῖς φιλοδ[οξοῦσι καὶ ταῦτα ? καὶ τήν] τοῦ πρυτανείου [σίτησιν οἱ Κουριεῖς ? ἀπο]νέμουσιν). Once again, the restorations are not of any probative value, since they are supported neither by parallel passages which establish the formulas employed nor by reasoned argument; they do not belong in the text of an *editio princeps*.<sup>19</sup>

78–83 These fragments, identified as "honorific decrees" and placed among the first edited inscriptions of the Roman period, are all scraps of

---

of these 'Queen' *oinochoi*." This work has now appeared, *Ptolemaic Oinochoai and Portraits in Faience* (Oxford 1973).

<sup>18</sup>The palaeographical observation itself includes an error: alpha with a straight bar is found in the Roman period; at Kourion itself, one may cite 89, 96, 98, 109, and 110 among many others.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1949, 51, on the methods of restoration used by scholars such as Dittenberger, Holleaux, and Wilhelm, based on the analysis of the remains of the text and a collection of parallel passages in other inscriptions. Of methods such as those used in *IKourion*, they remark "c'est bâtir sur le sable."

only a few letters each which can yield no sense and which should all have been consigned to the end of the corpus among the minor remains.<sup>20</sup>

84 The lemma of this inscription has been mentioned above as exemplary of the defects of the lemmas in this volume. It is presented as follows:

K. Vidua (1826), pl. 32, 1 and p. 36 (after the copy of another); *CIG.* no. 2632; A. A. Sakellarios p. 75 B; W. H. Engel, 1: p. 118, no. 3; *IGR* 3: no. 971; T. B. Mitford, *BSA* 42 (1948): p. 210, n. 31. Cf. J. Letronne, *J. Sav.* 1827: p. 171; V. Chapot, *Mél. Cagnat*, p. 77, n. 4; p. 79, n. 7; *PIR*<sup>1</sup> 1: p. 63, no. 476 (Bassus) and 2: p. 188, no. 186 (Cordus); *RE* 10 (1919): p. 570, Julius 195 (Groag); *RE* 12 (1925); 1701 (Ritterling); *PIR*<sup>2</sup> 1: p. 108, no. 637 (Bassus); G. F. Hill, p. 255, no. 13.

For the principles of the construction of a lemma, see above, page 108. According to these principles, all of the editions mentioned here (except that by Mitford himself, which appeared in a footnote) depend upon the *editio princeps* by C. Vidua, and this fact should be rendered apparent by listing them within parentheses in chronological order.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, the reference to Letronne in this lemma should not be preceded by "cf.", since Letronne re-edited this inscription *in extenso* with amelioration of the text in the last line; rather, Letronne's work should figure in the list of complete editions immediately after that of Vidua, since it is the closest to Vidua's in date, and the *apparatus criticus* (omitted entirely here, as usual in this corpus) should indicate in what respect Letronne improved the text.

Finally, references which contribute nothing to our understanding of the document should simply be omitted, since the purpose of a lemma is not to display everything that the editor may have read about a document, but rather to present in accessible form everything that is useful.<sup>22</sup> The lemma of 84 should therefore read as follows:

C. Vidua, *Inscriptiones antiquae a comite Carolo Vidua in Turcico itinere collectae*, 1826 (after another's copy), p. 36 and Pl. 32 (J.-A. Letronne, *Journal des Savants* 1827, p. 171;

<sup>20</sup>Here readings and commentary are often arbitrary; for a single example cf. the commentary on 83: "The letters TA of line 10 [the only letters preserved in this line; the following line consists of a single tau] hint that the honorand was a *civis* with the *praenomen* Gaius; and hence our tentative attribution to the outset of the principate."

<sup>21</sup>Cf. *La Carie* 2.13: the "abondance sybilline" of an improperly constructed lemma is easy to provide, but harmful to the reader who tries to study the inscription.

<sup>22</sup>J. and L. Robert, *Bull.épigr.* 1950, 63: it is essential to distinguish the various types of editions lest the reader be buried under a growing pile of references. Cf. also *Bull.épigr.* 1953, 257; L. Robert in *AntCl* 4 (1935) 462; *RevPhil* (1958) 19; and *Gnomon* 31 (1959) 10 on the use of parentheses and 11 on the distinction between complete editions and partial citations; *Gnomon* 42 (1970) 581 on the exclusion of secondary literature that contributes nothing to the study of the text. On another work of Mitford, *Bull.épigr.* 1963, 300: "c'est une enfilade confuse de références, qui est pratiquement inutilisable."

A. Boeckh, *CIG* II 2632; R. Cagnat and G. Lafaye, *IGR* III 971; T. B. Mitford, *BSA* 42 (1947) 210 n. 31 (after a squeeze).

The references to V. Chapot, *Mélanges Cagnat* (who cites the text in a note listing dedications to Roman emperors and in a note for the formula *Κουριέων ἡ πόλις*) and to G. F. Hill, *A History of Cyprus* (who cites the document in a list of "proconsuls, legates and quaestors in Cyprus"), contribute nothing and should both disappear.<sup>23</sup> Citations of *RE* and *PIR* (for the proconsuls) also do not belong in a lemma; such basic reference works should be cited, if necessary, in the course of the commentary, in the case that the author has something to say about them.<sup>24</sup>

An editor who devotes his attention to the construction of a correct lemma benefits not only his readers but also himself, for understanding of the transmission of a text and of the modifications it has undergone at the hands of its successive editors is essential for its correct presentation, and even for its interpretation. An example is furnished by this inscription. In lines 6–7 Mitford prints as follows the name of the proconsul who consecrated the emperor's statue: Δούκιος Ἀννίος Βάσ[σος | ἀνθύ]πατος and comments "Vidua in lines 6, 7: ΒΑΣΙΛΗΟΤ | [Τ]ΠΑΤΟΣ." It was Letronne who restored in lines 6–7 [ἀνθύ]πατος, which is the restoration adopted here (except for placement of the letters); but Boeckh carried the emendation of this passage further in *CIG*, which Mitford cites in his lemma without having absorbed Boeckh's commentary: "*Proconsulem eum Cypri fuisse . . . vidit Letr. qui eum cognomine Βασίλειος vocatum censebat, vel patris nomen Βασιλίου s. Βασιλείου vs. 6 extr. latere putabat. Sed recte censor in Annal. Heidelb. 1828 p. 403 vidit litteras ΛΗΟΤ in ΑΝΘΤ mutandas esse, sublato illo vs. 7 [Τ].*" Boeckh also recognized the cognomen: "*Utut vitium natum censebis, pro ΒΑΣΙ est ΒΑΣΣΟΣ scribendum.*" Boeckh's text was thus Βάσ[σος] ἀνθύ[πατος] (although he printed this with ανθ in brackets).

<sup>23</sup>W. H. Engel, *Kypros* 1 (Berlin 1841) 118–119, no. 3, and A. A. Sakellarios, *Ta Kypriaka* (Athens 1855) 75 B' both merely cite the inscription after *CIG*, without any commentary (in his lemma Mitford lists these works in reverse chronological order; the correct date of publication of Sakellarios' book is 1855, as Mitford states on p. xv, and not 1845, as he states on p. 398). Is it not a cruel joke on the reader to send him off on a search after these rare works, only to find, when he has finally procured them, that they reproduce letter for letter the text of *CIG* without a word of comment? If the editor considered these books worth mentioning in his lemma, surely it was incumbent upon him to warn his readers that neither edition makes any contribution whatsoever, so as to avoid a needless waste of time and effort on the part of anyone seeking to verify and perhaps ameliorate this text. Furthermore, since Mitford chose to cite the first edition of Sakellarios' work, why did he not also mention the enlarged second edition (Athens 1890) in which the same text is again reproduced, still without commentary, on p. 69, no. 10?

<sup>24</sup>They should still, however, be consulted: Mitford remarks (on 87) that the name Seppius was previously unknown, although it is registered with examples in *RE* 2A (1923) 1549.

The beginning of the title ἀνθύπατος thus stood on line 6, not (as Mitford prints it) 7, and the beginning of line 7 was likewise undamaged and contained the remainder of the title, when it was seen by Vidua's unnamed source; these letters should therefore not be printed within brackets as though they had to be restored.

This observation leads in turn to further consequences. In his first edition of this document Mitford had asserted that this inscription "can hardly be concerned with a statue"<sup>25</sup> and that it is in any case a dedication to the Emperor Claudius rather than to Nero. In the latter view he followed the previous editors (Boeckh: "*Titulus pertinet ad a. Chr. 52;*" Cagnat-Lafaye: "*Anno XII Claudii imperantis 52 p.C.n.*"). The text is presented in *IKourion* as follows:

- [Νέρωνι] Κλανδίω Καίσαρι Σεβαστῶι  
Γερμανικῶι, ἀρχιερεῖ μεγίστωι,  
 3 δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας, αὐτοκράτορι,  
πατρὶ πατρίδος ὡς Κουριέων ἡ πόλις  
ἀπὸ τῶν προσκεκριμένων ὑπὸ Ἰουλίου  
 6 Κόρδου ἀνθυπάτου ὡς Λούκιος Ἀννίος Βάσ[σος]  
[ἀνθύ]πατος ὡς καθιέρωσεν L ιβ'

In his second edition, Mitford admits that this stone did serve as a statue base and abandons his former attribution to Claudius. His grounds are as follows (p. 154):

"Vidua's authority gave for line 1 only Κλανδίω Καίσαρι Σεβαστῶι. Since it can now be shown not merely that the lower left-hand corner of the stone had then already perished [we have seen that the contrary is true] but that he failed to appreciate the fact [the failure is Mitford's] it is indeed very possible that the upper left-hand corner had similarly suffered. We are, therefore, under no obligation to defend Κλανδίω Καίσαρι Σεβαστῶι, unparalleled as this would be in the formal dedication of a statue of either Claudius or Nero, [<sup>26</sup>] and may legitimately emend this by the addition either of Τιβερίωι or of Νέρωνι—the latter indeed the more economical of space, but even the former could give a line shorter than lines 3, 5, and 6."

The grounds for this change of opinion thus rest entirely on failure to appreciate the fact that the lower left portion of the stone was complete and undamaged when it was seen by Vidua's authority, and the argument collapses. However, other scholars had already suggested the attribution of

<sup>25</sup>*BSA* 42 (1947) 210, no. 31. Although this inscription is cut on what was certainly a statue base (on another side it bears the Hellenistic inscription 45, of which the lemma is equally unsatisfactory: compare Dittenberger's clear presentation in *OGIS* 152), Mitford reached this conclusion on the basis of "the use of the dative case and the fact that it is inscribed on a narrow face of the stone."

<sup>26</sup>In his first edition Mitford cited Ritterling and Groag, who held a similar view, but dissented: "I see no good reason for ascribing this inscription to Nero rather than Claudius."

this statue to Nero rather than to Claudius for prosopographical reasons<sup>27</sup> independent of Mitford's considerations. Since the reason advanced in *IKourion* for the absence of Nero's name from this base is demonstrably erroneous, we propose another explanation: the base was complete when seen by Vidua's authority, but Nero's name had been erased already in antiquity as a result of his *damnatio memoriae*.

85 Two fragments, copied by Sakellarios and Waddington, are united by Mitford to form a single inscription honoring Trajan.<sup>28</sup> The text is presented as follows:

Αὐτοκ[ρ]άτωρ [Καίσαρ Τραϊανός]<sup>29</sup>  
 (᾿Αδρ)ιανὸς Σεβαστὸς Γ[ερ]μανικὸς [Δακικὸς Παρθικὸς],  
 [Θεοῦ Νέρουα Τ]ραϊαν[οῦ] Καίσαρος υἱ[ός, Θεοῦ]  
 [Νέρουα νιωνός, Θ]εὸν Τραϊανὸν τὸ[ν πατέρα]

<sup>27</sup>In the first edition of *PIR*, E. Klebs (s.v. L. Annii Bassus, p. 63, no. 476) and H. Dessau (s.v. Q. Iulius Cordus, p. 188, no. 186) had considered these men as proconsuls of Cyprus under Claudius, and they were once followed by E. Groag (*RE* 10 [1917] 570, s.v. Iulius 195; thus already P. v. Rohden in *RE* 1 [1894] 2264, s.v. Annii 33); but E. Ritterling in 1925 (*RE* 12.1701 s.v. Legio) placed the proconsulship of Bassus in 66, "*probabiliter*" according to Groag's second edition (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I s.v. L. Annii Bassus, p. 108, no. 637). Curiously, L. Petersen in 1966 (*PIR*<sup>3</sup> IV s.v. Q. Iulius Cordus, p. 201, no. 272; not cited by Mitford in *IKourion*), although she refers to the entry by Groag in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> s.v. L. Annii Bassus, did not realize its consequences or does not agree with the view there expressed, for she states that Q. Iulius Cordus was proconsul of Cyprus "*sub Claudio paulo ante 52, praecessit L. Annio Basso*." Petersen also says of Cordus that "*idem vel propter lapsum temporis frater potius homonymus legatus Aquitaniae anno 69 milites in verba Othonis obstrinxit*" (*Tac.Hist.* 1.76.1), although Groag in *RE* (cited above) had considered the proconsul of Cyprus to be the same person as the legate of Aquitania, a conclusion which would in any case follow the dating of his proconsulship of Cyprus to the reign of Nero.

<sup>28</sup>Although Mitford states that "I now associate" these fragments, in fact he had already published the complete text a decade ago, in *AJA* 65 (1961) 124 (in the commentary on an inscription of Karpasia), duly registered in *SEG* 20 (1964) 157. Despite his claim that the association of these two fragments is a new feature of the present work, Mitford complains on p. 159 that "J. and L. Robert ignore this inscription in their current [*sic*] Bulletin, *REG* 74 (1961) pp. 119-268 (I must assume) as a mark of their displeasure." If a scholar persists in publishing his revised editions of previously known texts as part of the commentary on a quite different inscription from another city (as in *AJA*) or even as part of a footnote (see above on 84), he cannot with justice complain that they are not discussed in a Bulletin which covers each year, within the limits of the possible, all of the publications on Greek epigraphy from every region of the ancient world. Mitford's article in *AJA* 65 was in fact analyzed in detail, with numerous corrections, in *Bull. épigr.* 1962, 323-343 (pp. 210-212). The statue of Trajan was likewise "ignored" in the mention of this article by *Année épigr.* 1961, p. 3.

<sup>29</sup>Here the editor tacitly abandons his earlier view set forth and defended in *AJA* 65 (1961) 124 n. 134, that Τραϊανός was not included in this text among the names of Hadrian.

The association of the two fragments depends upon correction of Waddington's reading of line 1 as ΑΠΙΕ into ΑΤΩΡ and upon three corrections in the readings reported by Sakellarios, notably <Ἀδρ>ιανός for Τραϊανός in line 2. Mitford cites no parallel for Hadrian's alleged erection of a statue of Trajan in this small provincial city.

This very doubtful text, in which according to the restorations Hadrian receives the military titles Γ[ερ]μανικός [Δακικός Παρθικός], is dated precisely to A.D. 129 on the grounds that Hadrian was at Antioch in Syria during 129–130 and that "it would indeed be foreign to his character to give almost a year to Syria but leave unvisited a province visible from the Syrian coast." Cf. page 198: "that [Hadrian] should have crossed, if only briefly, at least to the nearest portion of the island that is actually visible from the summit of the Mons Casius which he found time to climb is, therefore, very plausible." Hence Mitford concludes that during a visit to the Sanctuary of Apollo Hylates, or at least during a visit to the island of Cyprus, Hadrian ordered the erection "by proxy or in person" of this statue of his adoptive father.<sup>30</sup>

Like the elaborate argumentation in favor of a visit to the Sanctuary of Apollo Hylates by Trajan in the commentary on 111, this effort to establish a visit by Hadrian is pure hypothesis supported by no evidence. And like the conclusions drawn from the supposed visit of Trajan, also the deductions from the supposed visit of Hadrian are demonstrably false. The military titles which Hadrian inherited from his predecessor were borne by this eminently peaceful emperor only at the very beginning of his reign and then dropped;<sup>31</sup> thus the seven previously tabulated inscriptions on which Hadrian has these military titles (of which five were found in Cyprus and Achaia)<sup>32</sup> are all dated to 117–118. It is clear therefore that the date of 129 assigned to this text, on the basis of Hadrian's supposed visit to Cyprus in that year, is excluded.

86 This text is the base of a statue of Κοῖνον Καίλιον Ὀνωρᾶτον,<sup>33</sup> ἐπαρχον

<sup>30</sup>In connection with this "visit" of Hadrian, Mitford states that Salamis obtained the title of *μητρόπολις* under Hadrian "as did Damascus and Petra in A.D. 129 or 130." But G. W. Bowersock points out that Petra was in fact *μητρόπολις* already under Trajan: cf. *JRS* 61 (1971) 231–233.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. P. Kneissl, *Die Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser* (Diss. Marburg; Göttingen 1969) 91 ff.; on p. 93 Kneissl observes that "Die auf den ersten Münzen Hadrians begegnenden Siegerbeinamen hatten zum Teil auch Eingang in die Titulatur der Inschriften gefunden. Die geringe Anzahl derartiger Inschriften entspricht der kurzen Zeitspanne, in welcher diese Titulatur offizielle Gültigkeit besass."

<sup>32</sup>The sixth is a milestone in Syria. Kneissl remarks: "Auffallend bleibt, dass diese Inschriften mit einer Ausnahme [in the Provincia Proconsularis] aus den östlichen Provinzen kommen. Dies wird darauf zurückzuführen sein, dass Hadrian sich in den ersten Monaten nach seinem Regierungsantritt in Syrien und Kleinasien aufhielt."

<sup>33</sup>In his discussion of the orthography of the name, Mitford cites (p. 161 n. 1) after

σείτου δόσεως δήμου Ῥωμαίων, πρεσβευτὴν Σικελίας, πρεσβευτὴν Πόντου καὶ Βεθυλίας, ἀνθύπατον Κύπρου.<sup>34</sup> Mitford comments (p. 160) that this inscription "states that its honorand, now *praefectus frumenti dandi* and presumably therefore resident in Rome, had been successively legate of the senatorial provinces of Sicily and Pontus-Bithynia—both quaestorian functions—and thereafter proconsul of Cyprus," and concludes (p. 161) that "Kourion pays homage to her benefactor, the recently departed governor, then in honorable employment in Rome awaiting a consulship." But is it not the case that the statue of this proconsul (*cos.suff.* 105) was erected *during his term of office* in Cyprus and not after his departure? The capacity in which he was honored by Kourion naturally appears at the end of his list of titles. Furthermore, G. W. Bowersock points out that in Sicily and Pontus-Bithynia Honoratus held not a quaestorian but a praetorian legateship, comparing Dio 53.14 (quoted by Mommsen, *St.R.* 2<sup>3</sup> 1, 246 n. 3) on legates of praetorian governors ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων σφίσιν ἢ καὶ τῶν ὑποδεστέρων and W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (Munich 1970) chapter 3 ("Die Stellung des *Legatus proconsulis* in der senatorischen Laufbahn") 38–47, who argues on the basis of numerous examples that praetorian legates were the norm because of their prior judicial experience.

Finally, in Mitford's discussion of the office of *praefectus frumenti dandi* one misses a reference to D. van Berchem, *Les distributions de blé et d'argent à la plèbe romaine sous l'empire* (Geneva 1939); the editor also does not know H.-G. Pflaum's detailed study of this office<sup>35</sup> with its accompanying table that lists sixty-three holders of this post from Augustus to Diocletian (the man honored at Kourion is no. 27, assigned by Pflaum to the reign of Antoninus Pius).<sup>36</sup> This has an unfortunate effect

---

E. Groag (the correct reference is *PIR*<sup>2</sup> II p. 26 no. 137) "an Attic ephebic list of ca. A.D. 110–120 (*IG* 3, no. 1101)." The ephebic lists of Athens have, however, been re-edited (in 1927) as part of the *editio minor* designated *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>, where this document has its place as no. 2020. Since the second volume of the revised edition of *PIR* was published in 1936, one is surprised to find Groag still citing *IG* 3; but upon verification one finds that Groag wrote exactly this: "*in catalogo epheborum Atticorum . . . IG* 3, 1101 = 2/3<sup>2</sup> 2020 col. I 40 *memoratur* K. Καίλιος Ὀυεῖρος quidam Κηφι(σίου)." Having thus in front of him references to both the first edition (1878) and the second edition (1927) of this document, Mitford suppressed mention of *IG* 2<sup>2</sup> and chose to cite only the edition of 1878.

<sup>34</sup>On the lemma of this text, known since the latter part of the last century, the same criticism is to be made as above on 84.

<sup>35</sup>"La chronologie de la carrière de L. Caesennius Sospes: Contribution à l'étude des responsables sénatoriaux de la distribution de blé à la plèbe romaine," *Historia* 2 (1953/4) 431–450.

<sup>36</sup>According to Pflaum the office of *praefectus frumenti dandi* was this individual's first praetorian post.

on the commentary, for the discussion on page 160 of previous efforts<sup>37</sup> to date this inscription "on the strength of its lettering" ignores the central fact, demonstrated by van Berchem and once more by Pflaum, that the office of *praefectus frumenti dandi* did not exist from the death of Claudius until its recreation by Nerva in A.D. 97. This proconsul is also mentioned on the fragment 109, a block preserving part of the dedicatory inscription (in the name of Trajan) of the Kourion gate to the Sanctuary of Apollo;<sup>38</sup> and Mitford wants to identify him in the letters KAI of 110, which concerns a construction made ἐξ ὑποσχέσεω[s].<sup>39</sup>

87 We will discuss this inscription at length in *Chronique d'Egypte*.

89 The base of a statue : Ποπλικόλαν Πρέϊσκόν<sup>40</sup> με πόλις Περσῆος ἄγαλμα | κοίρανον ἀγνείας στήσατο παρ' τεμένει. The editor dates this inscription to the "late second or early third century A.D." on the basis of the letter

<sup>37</sup>This discussion radically misrepresents the view expressed by E. Groag: "On the strength of its lettering this inscription was ascribed tentatively by Cagnat in *IGR* to the reign of Trajan; by Myres and Hill to the close of the first century. Groag in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> showed a strong preference for the earlier date." In fact, Groag showed a preference for a later date, later even than the reign of Trajan: "*Vix idem atque Q. Co . . . consul suffectus a. 116 (n. 1210), scil. aliquanto recentior*" (thus also Pflaum). Furthermore, it is simply not true that "this inscription was ascribed tentatively by Cagnat in *IGR* to the reign of Trajan": this ascription was the accomplishment of W. H. Waddington, whose name appears nowhere in Mitford's discussion but who is quite clearly cited by Cagnat (the latter makes no pretence of advancing a new personal opinion): "*Proconsul Cypri anno ignoto circa Trajani principatum, ut inspecto monumento iudicavit Waddington.*" The date assigned by Waddington, as reported more accurately in *PIR*<sup>1</sup> 1 p. 432, no. 995, is remarkably exact: "*litteras saeculi primi exeuntis vel secundi ineuntis esse iudicavit.*"

<sup>38</sup>Although Mitford states that this text is "unpublished," a good photograph was published by Scranton (note 24, in part I), 52, fig. 46b (detailed discussion, 56–57).

<sup>39</sup>On this term the editor comments (p. 215): "For a recent [?] discussion of this practice, cf. L. Robert, *BCH* 60 (1936): pp. 194 ff.; *Études anatoliennes*, p. 526." Upon verification, the passage in the article cited (now *Op.Min.Sel.* 2. 901 ff.) turns out to be a collection of documents attesting gifts of portions of colonnades or stoas, assembled to illustrate a text concerning the construction by a benefactor of a colonnaded avenue in Laodicea ad Mare as acquittal of the *summa honoraria*; the second passage collects inscriptions mentioning gifts of one or more individual columns to explain a text carved on an architrave at Stratonicea in Caria. Neither passage discusses the term ἐξ ὑποσχέσεως, which is foreign to the subjects at issue. Unfortunately Scranton (p. 62) utilizes Mitford's text of this inscription to date the construction of the bath near the Sanctuary of Apollo, without realizing how fragile is his interpretation of the scrap.

<sup>40</sup>Mitford identifies this person with L. Valerius Helvidius Priscus Publicola, known from *CIL* 6. 1530 (not "p. 1530") and p. 852, "a Roman inscription dated by its lettering to the third century." (R. Hanslik, *RE* 8A [1955] 41 s.v. Valerius 197, remarks that "Er muss verwandt mit dem cos. 196, L. Valerius Messalla Thrasea Priscus . . . gewesen sein, wahrscheinlich war er sein Vater. Demnach gehört er wohl in die Zeit des Marc. Aurel.") But the commentary in *CIL* states exactly "*litteris tertii circiter saeculi exeuntis*" and the style of the Kourion inscription does not exclude a date at the end of the third century [see following note].)

forms, but on the basis of content this date is excluded: style, employment of metre, and vocabulary are all typical of the honorific epigrams studied by L. Robert in *Hellenica* 4: *Épigrammes du Bas-Empire* (Paris 1948), which form a very distinctive and coherent group of documents extending from the end of the third century until the sixth.<sup>41</sup>

90 Three fragments (one discovered in the excavations of A. H. S. Megaw in 1959 and already lost) form this inscription honoring the proconsul Δεκ. Πλαύτιον Φ[ήλικ]α Ἰουλία[νόν]. Although this text is described here as “unpublished,” an identical text appeared in *AJA* 65 (1961) 104 no. 3 and again in *SEG* 20 (1964) 158. Moreover, the commentary on pages 169–170, including the hypothesis on the date (see below) is essentially repeated almost word for word from pages 104–105 of Mitford’s article in *AJA*. In this commentary he must recant another date based on his judgment of letter forms: “From the lettering of (1) and (2) [other inscriptions honoring this proconsul and his daughter] I at one time favored an Antonian [i.e. Antonine] date for this proconsulship,<sup>[42]</sup> but the present inscription points decisively to the earlier years of the Severan era.” In line 4 the date of 197 is obtained by the restoration ἐξ ὑ|ποσχέσεως [τοῦ πέμπ]του ἔτους<sup>43</sup> on grounds that are not at all convincing.<sup>44</sup> One is therefore scarcely surprised to find that here again this book of 1971 has been superseded by an article of Mitford’s which appeared in 1966: having to find a place for a newly-discovered proconsul of Cyprus, Mitford wrote in that year,<sup>45</sup> “we must rest content with the probability that Tib. Claudius Subatianus Proculus was *proconsul* of Cyprus from July 197 to July 198.” Naturally this leads to a new (in 1966) date for Felix Julianus, which is not registered in *IKourion*: “Elsewhere I have

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Robert’s remarks, *Hellenica* 4.108–109: the inscriptions of this long period are consistent in themes, formulas, and style, and it is often not possible to be precise in dating these texts.

<sup>42</sup>*BSA* 42 (1947) 216–217.

<sup>43</sup>Contrary to the statement on 168–169, this line does not end one letter short of the line above it; rather it extends one letter beyond line 3, as is clear on the photograph; nor is it true that the letters of line 4 are “very much broader” than those of the other lines. According to Mitford’s restorations the four lines of this inscription have 32, 31, 29, and 24 letters respectively—but since line 4 begins at the left margin (it is not centered) and extends to the right, with letters of normal size, beyond the preceding line, this restoration is clearly too short. It must be remarked that the right margin of line 4 is quite clear on the photograph and does not in fact correspond to the position which it has in Mitford’s text.

<sup>44</sup>“A case can thus be made for assigning the erection of this statue and the proconsulship of D. Plautius Felix Julianus, a man otherwise unknown to us, to—shall we say—the summer of A.D. 197 when, with the victory over Albinus in March of that year, the position of the Severan dynasty became secure, its partisans able to express their partisanship without uneasiness by embarking upon constructions . . .”

<sup>45</sup>*AJA* 70 (1966) 92.

conjectured that D. Plautius Felix Julianus . . . may have governed the island in precisely that year. If we can now regard Felix Julianus as (shall we say) the immediate successor of Aufidius Bassus an unbroken sequence of three Severan governors will be presented." The construction of provincial *fasti* by such a method is unlikely to produce reliable results.

95 Two sets of non-joining fragments are heavily restored as a text in honor of Julia Domna.<sup>46</sup> In his commentary on this document, Mitford states that "at Kition a priestess of this empress is known," referring to an earlier publication by himself; but in the article cited<sup>47</sup> it is stated that this inscription was of "doubtful provenance," and J. and L. Robert<sup>48</sup> consider that in the phrase τὴν ἀρχιερασαμένην Ἰουλίας Σε[β]αστῆς the identification of the empress as Julia Domna (advanced by Mitford without question) "nous paraît très loin d'être assuré." The readers of the present work are further informed (p. 178) that outside Cyprus the cult of Julia Domna was, "it would seem, otherwise foreign to the Greek East"! Once again the editor has failed even to consult the *RE* (references for the divine honors and cults accorded Julia Domna are there collected by G. Herzog in the article devoted to this empress, 10 [1918] 928-929); quite aside from the cults of Julia Domna in the neighbouring province of Syria,<sup>49</sup> how can one ignore the golden statue of Julia Domna erected in the Parthenon?<sup>50</sup>

96 This inscription, which consists almost entirely of the titles of Caracalla, is restored as follows: Ἀυτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Μ. [Αὐρήλιον] Σεῦηρον Ἀντωνέينو[ν, ἀνίκητον], ? Εὐσεβῇ Εὐτυχῇ Σεβαστόν, [Παρθικόν] μέγιστον,

<sup>46</sup>The editor comments (p. 178) on "the general similarity alike in form and in size of the letters" of this inscription and the preceding (height of letters and thickness of stone are said to be the same); in fact one wonders whether fragment *a* of 94 could not just as well be a part of 95. The text of neither of these heavily-restored documents can be regarded as assured: in 94, the first letter of the second fragment is omicron rather than alpha, and the lambda that serves to abbreviate the praenomen of Septimius Severus has a dot at either side, which indicates that the letter doubtless did not stand at the beginning of a line. These observations suffice to invalidate the suggested restoration. Clearly it would be possible to restore these meagre scraps quite differently, without introduction of the idiom μέν . . . δέ into the imperial titulature and without restoring an erased mention of Geta.

<sup>47</sup>*Opus Arch* 6 (1950) 81-83, no. 44; also p. 317 of this book: "of unknown provenience."

<sup>48</sup>*Bull.épigr.* 1951, 236. This view was either overlooked by Mitford or failed to convince him.

<sup>49</sup>To cite only one example, her bust replaced the head of the city Tyche on the portable shrine depicted on coins of Laodicea ad Mare.

<sup>50</sup>*JG* 2<sup>a</sup> 1076; cf. O. Broneer, *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 178-184, no. 45 and J. H. Oliver, *Ath.Stud.Ferguson* (HSCP Suppl. Vol. 1 [1940]) 521-530 (cf. *Bull.épigr.* 1946-47, 101). See most recently H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia* 27 (1958) 155, on a fine miniature portrait head of Julia Domna found in the Agora and on the "special relations that existed between the Empress and Athens," and R. S. Stroud, *Hesperia* 40 (1971) 200-204.

Βρεταννικὸν μέ[γιστον], ἀρχιερέα μέγιστον, δημαρχ(ικῆς) ἐ[ξουσίας], πατέρα πατρίδος, Κουρίων ἡ πό[λις]. On [ἀνίκητον]?, the editor admits that he can cite no reference in its defence; we suggest rather [Ἀδγουστον], for which there are parallels.<sup>51</sup>

**100** The commentary to this honorific inscription contains an aberrant excursus in the area of institutions. In line 6 of this inscription is restored, among the honours enjoyed by an anonymous individual, the fact that he was [καὶ τῶν] δεκα[πρώτ]ων.<sup>52</sup> There is no way to know the relative positions of the two scraps combined in the restoration of this word, nor is it verifiable that the fragment with ΔΕΚΑ belongs to this text at all. The introduction of the word here is therefore quite arbitrary. In line 6 of **101**, among the offices held by another anonymous honorand, is restored [δεκαπρωτεύσα]ς? with the comment, “alternatives are [γυμνασιαρχήσα]ς?, [γραμματεύσα]ς? etc.” This too is an arbitrary restoration; the editor himself recognized that any number of other supplements are equally possible, and this alone should suffice—according to the rules of correct method—to exclude any one of them, chosen of necessity at random, from the text. The third and last appearance of the same word in this volume is in line 5 of **103**, another list of municipal offices: δε[καπρωτεύσ]ας β'. The arbitrary nature of this restoration also is apparent at a glance. Thus the institution of δεκάπρωτοι is nowhere attested for Kourion. Furthermore, the editor comments: “For the δεκάπρωτοι, a committee of wealthy citizens, charged with the allocation and the levying of Imperial taxation, we may turn to no. 100 above.<sup>[53]</sup> . . . The definitive study is that of E. G. Turner, *JEA* 22 (1936) pp. 7 ff.; but an inscription of Iotape in Rough Cilicia, *IGR* 3: no. 833, lines 9–11, reading (on the revision of G.E. Bean and myself) [δεκαπρω]τεύσαν|τος πλειστά[κ]ις ἐπὶ τῇ[ς] εἰσαγωγῇ τῶν κυ|ριακῶν φόρων πιστῶς, makes a valuable contribution to this subject.” The document cited was republished by Bean and Mitford in *Wiener Denkschriften* 85 (1965) 24–25 no. 29a, where they comment: “we offer a reading which defines very adequately the function of the δεκάπρωτοι—and in so doing is unique.” But the “definitive study” of Turner cited in *IKourion* refers twice (14, n. 10 and 15, n. 7) for this inscription of Iotape to E. Hula, *JOAI* 5 (1902) 203. In the words of Louis Robert,<sup>54</sup> “Il est

<sup>51</sup>For inscriptions of Caracalla with both Ἀδγουστος and Σεβαστός, cf. for example *IG* 7.2500 (Thebes) and *IGR* 3.5 (Nicomedia), the latter also published (no reference in *IGR*) as *CIG* 3770, with informative commentary (following Letronne) and citation of parallels by Boeckh (“*nimirum altera vox . . . ad nomen ipsum pertinere visa est, et alterum vocabulum additum tanquam elogium honorarium*”). The mu at the end of line 1 as well as the epsilon at the end of line 4 and the omicron at the end of line 6 must all be dotted, if they are to be read at all.

<sup>52</sup>The dotted omega is not verifiable on the photograph and is doubtless imaginary.

<sup>53</sup>It is apparent how one such supplement serves to support and reinforce another.

<sup>54</sup>*Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale* (Paris 1966) 76–77.

dommage que les auteurs de ce mémoire . . . n'aient pas connu l'article publié en 1902 par E. Hula . . . qui a pour titre *Dekaprotie und Eikosa-protie*. C'était intéressant pour le sujet. Mais il y a mieux: E. Hula a publié là, p. 203, la copie d'Heberdey pour les lignes 1–11. Cette publication rendait complètement inutile celle des nouveaux voyageurs, car elle la dévance sur tous les points, et Hula a restitué, 1. 9–11: [δεκαπρω]εύσαντος πλειστάκις ἐπὶ τῇ[s . . . . .] γῆς τῶν κυριακῶν φόρων πιστῶς; il a songé au mot [ἀπαγω]γῆς.<sup>55</sup> As for the restoration [δεκαπρω]τεύσαντος, Robert had this to say (in 1966):<sup>56</sup> “Je dois ajouter que je ne vois pas sur quoi se fonde la restitution précise [δεκαπρω]τεύσαντος, ni comment se justifie ce verbe suivi de ἐπὶ et du génitif; on attendrait un verbe de sens assez général: ‘ayant présidé au recouvrement des impôts impériaux’.” Although these remarks published in 1966 are ignored in a book published in 1971, it is clear that the verb δεκαπρωτεύω and the noun δεκάπρωτος must be expelled from each of these four inscriptions in which they have been restored.<sup>57</sup>

**104** This curious metrical hymn to Antinoos, in the style of Mesomedes, is discussed by W. D. Lebek in *ZPE* 12 (1973) 101–137.

**107** This inscription consists of three entablature fragments, of which two are illustrated on a photograph and all are shown in a drawing, in which their relative position does not correspond with the restored text. On these three pieces was an inscription in Latin and Greek of which no complete word is preserved; its chief interest lies in the names [I]ulium and [K]όρδου, on the basis of which are constructed restorations of about 100 and 150 letters for the Latin and Greek texts respectively. Although the editor states that this document is “unpublished,” R. Stillwell<sup>58</sup> published a decade ago a photograph of the same two fragments illustrated here, together with a transcription of the letters in both languages.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>55</sup>Cf. *Documents* 120, n. 1: “Je croirais en tout cas que tel est bien le mot à restituer dans l'inscription de Iotapè.”

<sup>56</sup>Turner had remarked (*loc. cit.*), “Any one of γραμματεύσαντος, ἱερατεύσαντος, ἐπιμελητεύσαντος, ταμειεύσαντος, etc., might be restored, but would not suit the context.”

<sup>57</sup>For *dekaprotoi* on Cyprus itself, the editor fails to refer to the inscription (“perhaps from Salamis”) he published in *Opus Arch* 6 (1950) 89–92, no. 48, the statue base of a man δεκαπρω[εύσαντ]α.

<sup>58</sup>Stillwell, “Kourion: the theater” in *ProcPhilSoc* 105 (1961) 74.

<sup>59</sup>Mitford states that on his fragment *c*, which bears the letters ΤΩΡ, “all three letters are broken . . . *omicron* is a less probable alternative to *omega*.” In fact, the last two of these three letters are complete and visible on both of the published photographs; *omicron* is excluded. On p. 206 is discussed, among the “remarkable forms” shown by the Greek lettering, the “tailed” rho—but this feature is absent from the editor's drawings of the letter in question.

The restorations are offered with some confidence: "the above reconstruction of the text, while offered *exempli gratia*, may in general outline be accepted . . . We may presume that Nero was credited with the erection of this Theater simply because the proconsul, acting (we may suppose) on instructions from Rome, sanctioned its rebuilding."<sup>60</sup> The editor adds in a note, however, that "I have now, since writing the above, consulted Professor Stillwell's admirable study of the theater of Kourion [which appeared in 1961]. Here I can only note that he considers a long inscription on the entablature of the stage building improbable." It appears therefore that although architectural considerations render Mitford's restorations dubious—they are in themselves gratuitous and without support—he is content to state this fact and leave his text without change.<sup>61</sup>

**108** This dedication, one of the noteworthy previously unpublished documents of the volume, with its letters painted red and blue in alternate lines,<sup>62</sup> was erected by the proconsul Q. Laberius L.f. Aemilia Iustus Cocceius Lepidus<sup>63</sup> and concerns τὰς λειποῦσας ἐξέδρας δύο<sup>64</sup> of Apollo Caesar and Apollo Hylates, in the name of Trajan. The cult of Apollo

<sup>60</sup>This theory, that the city of Kourion had to receive permission from "Rome" in order to repair part of its theatre, like the similar conclusion about 111 in regard to administrative practices, assumes an improbable degree of centralization in the imperial administration, for which no proof is offered.

<sup>61</sup>On p. 206 are listed the "eight phases in the history of the theatre" identified by Stillwell; but comparison of Stillwell's text reveals that the "Neronian Period: A.D. 64/5 is represented only by the inscribed entablature blocks evidently from a scaenae frons." Of this supposed rebuilding under Nero Stillwell remarks, "Certainly, from that Emperor's well-known interest in the stage, the gesture would have been appropriate."

<sup>62</sup>Cf. for this practice L. Robert, *CRAI* (1955) 211 (*Op.Min.Sel.* 1.592: examples of inscriptions with alternate lines painted in different colors); *Bull.épigr.* 1959, 447 (Attaleia: red and blue in succeeding lines); *Bull.épigr.* 1967, 656 (Soloi: other references); etc.

<sup>63</sup>This proconsul is registered in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> 5.1 (1970) p. 2, no. 7 after an inscription at Rome (*CIL* 6.1440) and the present document, "*quod litteris communicavit T. B. Mitford a. 1949.*" The Roman inscription mentions among Laberius' offices the fact that he was [*leg(atu)s*] *missus ad principem*, which Mitford explains as follows: "The proconsul is shown by his second *nomen* to have been a connection or relative of the Emperor Nerva, and as such a suitable person to include (shall we say) in a deputation of senators sent to escort Trajan from the Rhine to Rome on the death of Nerva in A.D. 98." But Petersen advances the correct explanation: "*Legatione extraordinaria procul dubio post Antonium Saturninum, legatum Germaniae superioris a. 89, mense ut videtur Ianuario, debellatum, functus est.*"

<sup>64</sup>Mitford's discussion of these words reveals two imperfectly blended views: on the one hand, he cites R. Scranton who "sees no way of separating two of the *exedrae* of the South Building from the rest, so that it seems to him that the construction of all five was 'so designed and so begun from the foundations'" (cf. Scranton's detailed justification of this conclusion in his final publication of the building, not referred to by Mitford, *The Architecture of The Sanctuary of Apollo Hylates at Kourion* (Trans. Amer. Philos.

Caesar, attested by a half-dozen inscriptions from the excavations of the University Museum, was confined according to the editor to the reign of Trajan and thus "was in effect a veiled worship of Trajan himself"; but he has his doubts about the validity of his own hypothesis.<sup>65</sup>

**111** We will discuss this inscription and its problems in *Chronique d'Egypte*.

**121** Our only authority for this inscription, which (as restored) is the sole attestation of a dedication to Apollo Caesar alone without mention of Apollo Hylates, is a certain Duthoit<sup>66</sup> whose drawing of the letters Mitford reproduces, after Waddington; but who was this person? Nowhere else in this book is he mentioned and here not even his first initial is given; yet it is important to form some estimate of the training and epigraphic competence of this individual, since the accuracy of his copy is discussed here in some detail. The requisite information is provided by O. Masson.<sup>67</sup>

The document is dated in its heading to "A.D. 101?", but it is with no little surprise that one discovers the reason for the choice of this particular

---

Soc. 57.5 [1967]), 30-38); but on the other hand Mitford still offers what was evidently his original view: "we may perhaps infer that some enlargement in the scope of the cult—such, for example, as Trajan's sanction for the worship of Apollo Caesar—has justified an enlargement in the administrative quarters from an originally projected three to five offices." Since these two views are contradictory, both cannot be right; and it is Scranton's which has evidence in its support.

<sup>65</sup>Holding the theory that Apollo Caesar "took precedence over" Apollo Hylates in the earlier years of Trajan's reign (i.e., the name of Apollo Caesar was mentioned first), but that later in the reign Apollo Hylates reasserted his pre-eminence, Mitford has to explain **120**, a dedication in year 3 to 'Απόλλωνι Ἰλάτῃ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι Καίσαρι: either **120** (inscribed on a bronze jug) is "not official," or "the third regnal year refers, not to Trajan, but to his successor." On the other hand **122**, a fragment interpreted as a dedication to the two Apollos, poses a problem in the other direction: "the script appears to be earlier than the outset of Trajan's reign." By dating **124**, an ex-voto to Apollo Hylates and Apollo Caesar (in that order) "A.D. 102-117?", Mitford implies that he is prepared to admit that Apollo regained precedence over Apollo Caesar as early as 102.

<sup>66</sup>P. 235: "at the church of Hagios Nicolaos between Kolossi and Limassol, Duthoit about a century ago copied an inscription. The church is not marked on the modern one-inch survey of Cyprus and presumably [?] even in that day had become ruinous." The distance between Kolossi and Limassol is only about five miles, but Mitford does not say whether he ever undertook researches on the terrain to try to identify the site of the church even if it is not marked on the map.

<sup>67</sup>*Inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques* 20: in the chronological summary of Cypriot archaeological work is mentioned for 1862 "voyages et fouilles de la mission de Vogüé et Waddington, qui sont accompagnés par l'architecte E. Duthoit, et assistés par Grasset. Il n'y a pas eu de publication d'ensemble . . . l'itinéraire complet est figuré chez L. de Mas Latrie, *Carte de l'île de Chypre*, itinéraire no. 10." Masson presents further information concerning Edmond Duthoit (second visit to Cyprus, alone, in 1865; excavations at Golgoi) in *BCH* 95 (1971) 307-310.

year: the letter forms, "as shown by Duthoit"—"although little confidence can be placed in the exactness of these."<sup>68</sup> In the commentary on this text Mitford observes that names like 'Hρās are found "for the most part of women—a class very common in Egypt, but hardly to be found before the beginning of our era." But precisely for Egypt it suffices to turn to D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum* (Milan 1967 and following years—a supplement to Preisigke's *Namenbuch*)<sup>69</sup> to find Hellenistic attestations of 'Hρās, from the Zenon archive and the Ptolemaic ostraka in the Bodleian collection; Foraboschi also cites numerous examples of 'Hρās as a man's name. The restoration of 'Ο[ν]ή[σιλος]? in line 1 of this text lacks all justification.

**122** This scrap preserves all or part of six letters, dated in the heading "ca. A.D. 101?"<sup>70</sup> although one reads in the description of the letter forms that "this lettering could pass for late Hellenistic. If it is indeed as late as the age of Trajan, it is a notable example of an archaizing script." The fragment, which displays in three successive lines the letters ΑΠ, ΚΑ, ΑΠ, is restored as a dedication to Apollo Caesar and Apollo Hylates; but **64**, which preserves in two successive lines the letters ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ and ΑΠΟΛΛΩ, is assigned to the Hellenistic period,<sup>71</sup> and restored as a dedication to Apollo Hylates by an Apollonios! This hardly inspires confidence.

**123** This dedication by Πολύκτ[ητος] Τίμωνος to the two Apollos, incised on the neck of a large pithos, is dated without justification to "ca. A.D. 110?," although in the description of the letter forms it is stated merely that "this lettering, while difficult to date, is not inconsistent with the end of the first or the outset of the second century."<sup>72</sup> In the excavations of G. H. McFadden a pithos "preserved to the neck, upright" was found *in situ* on the site of the temple of Apollo, but "this large section of *pithos* was unfortunately not saved and its association with the fragments of no. 123 cannot now be demonstrated." Mitford provides no apparatus

<sup>68</sup>In particular "we may note the absence of any cursive forms, the broken-barred *alpha* and the *phi* of exceptional height; indications, perhaps, of a date towards the close of the first or at the outset of the second century:" hardly a justification for placing the document precisely in 101.

<sup>69</sup>In the commentary on **121** Mitford states that Preisigke's *Namenbuch* is "in effect a prosopography of Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Egypt"!

<sup>70</sup>Cf. above, n. 65, on the problems of this dating in connection with other documents.

<sup>71</sup>The editor comments that "cursive *omega* on stone is for the Hellenistic period remarkable" (untrue) and states of the letter-forms that they "closely resemble the lettering of Rhodian amphora-stamps of the second century B.C." (irrelevant).

<sup>72</sup>No key is provided to identify on the photograph the five fragments, of diverse provenance, which were assembled to give this text. The lemma states that "frag. 5 is unpublished" (which fragment is no. 5 is difficult to determine, for in his description Mitford designates the fragments by letters of the alphabet); but this document is not listed on p. 397 in the list of unpublished inscriptions.

giving earlier restorations and interpretations of the text,<sup>73</sup> and his own supplement [ὕπερ ἑαυτοῦ]? is quite arbitrary.<sup>74</sup>

**126** This document is said to be a "Hellenistic (?) terracotta figurine with an inscription of the second or third century A.D.? incised on the breast": but it is difficult to believe that the figurine ("very crude, of an unfamiliar and possibly local manufacture") and the inscription (enigmatic<sup>75</sup>) are not contemporary.<sup>76</sup> Starting from his reading *θειν*, which he interpreted as *θειν* = *θειον*, J. H. Oliver deduced that this figurine attests the existence at Kourion of a type of religious official well known at Delphi;<sup>77</sup> this theory is, correctly, rejected by Mitford as "unwarranted."

**127-142** In the midst of the inscriptions of the Roman period is placed, for reasons that are not clear, a group of sixteen lead sheets bearing imprecations, which were found together at the bottom of a well near Kourion towards the end of the last century and which are now in the British Museum.<sup>78</sup>

**143** This epitaph is the first of the group of such documents published here as **143-161**, and is evidently the one considered most important. It

<sup>73</sup>J. L. Myres, *Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus* (New York 1914) 594, no. 1908, had suggested [Πο]λυκτ[εανῶ] (after R. Meister) or perhaps [Πο]λυκτ[ήμονι] as an epithet of Apollo (cf. his translation on p. 320), followed (with *Τιρίων* in place of the earlier and correct reading *Τίμων*; also in his translation) by G. H. McFadden, *UPMB* 7.2 (1938) 11, according to whom "this is significant as it establishes beyond doubt that this is the Sanctuary of Apollo Hylates of which mention is made by ancient authors": but the precise location of the sanctuary was known long before the excavations of the University Museum (cf. Mitford's remarks on why he does not give *testimonia*, p. 4).

<sup>74</sup>On p. 240, n. 3, Mitford advances a quite different interpretation ("but it may well be"): "in that case presumably we have parents expressing their gratitude on behalf of their child." Such restorations based on no evidence and replaceable at the stroke of a pen by others entirely different but equally vain, do nothing to advance knowledge.

<sup>75</sup>J. H. Oliver read and restored [Ἀπό]λλωνός [με Χά]ροπα *θειν* [Ἀπολ]ώνειως [εὐχ]ήν, and saw in these words a dactylic hexameter. This is rightly rejected by Mitford, but his own suggestion [δ]ιοπα (from Hesychius *διοψ· ολκονόμος*) is hardly more convincing.

<sup>76</sup>J. H. and S. H. Young in their publication of the terracottas dated the figurine on stylistic grounds to the second century B.C. but considered that the letters could not be contemporary because of their "crudity" and must therefore indicate "a rededication" of the object during the Roman Empire; but are the letters really cruder than the figurine itself? Cf. **164-165** for other inscribed terracotta figurines, both dated to the "first century A.D.?"

<sup>77</sup>*Apud* Young and Young, 24-25: "It is possible that at this sanctuary as at the Delphian sanctuary of Apollo there were priests called *hosioi*."

<sup>78</sup>The inadequate edition here of these documents is examined in detail by Drew-Bear in *BASP* 9 (1972) 85-107.

consists of four non-joining fragments arranged to produce (with extensive restoration) a text interpreted as follows: "A daughter, named (it would seem) either Theodote or Diodote, set up this plaque to commemorate a mother who was alike the adopted child and the wife of one On[es -]." In addition to this case of incest the document also furnishes us with a new and otherwise unattested Greek word in the phrase *παῖδα παραθ[ερόν]*: "here I suspect an adjective \**παραθετός*, with the sense *θετός*, 'adopted'."<sup>79</sup> Since, however, both the structure of the family relationship and the new Greek word depend upon dubious readings and restorations,<sup>80</sup> it is recommended that sociologists and lexicographers alike treat these conclusions with caution.<sup>81</sup>

**144** Because this dedication to Apollo Hylates and Apollo Caesar, found in the Central Court of the Sanctuary of Apollo, is inscribed upon a limestone *cippus*, the editor considers that "although its construction is that of an honorific dedication—as if this stone carried the statue of Timo—I suspect that our inscription is in fact posthumous." There is nothing in the inscription to suggest this interpretation, which led the editor to class this dedication to the twin Apollos among the epitaphs. Likewise **160** and **161** are dedications to the θεός *Ἰψιστος*, wrongly interpreted (because they are inscribed on *cippi*) as Jewish or crypto-Christian epitaphs.<sup>82</sup> Mitford states that this "funerary capacity" of the Theos Hysistos was "confined I believe to these Cypriot inscriptions"!

**146** On this fragment, interpreted as an epitaph, the editor comments that "*ἡρωῖς*, very common in the funerary epigraphy of third-century Anatolia, occurs here [precisely there occur the letters HP] in Cyprus for the first time; while *ἡρώς* has, I believe, not yet been attested in the island in this sense." There has since been found at Kourion an epitaph with

<sup>79</sup>From this Mitford concludes: "it may well be that by the close of the first century of our era, as in Italy, so in Cyprus the old families were failing to reproduce themselves."

<sup>80</sup>In view of the fact that the relative position of the fragments is subject to uncertainty and that there is no way of estimating the original width, it is clear that other restorations, at least equally plausible, might readily be proposed.

<sup>81</sup>Lexicographers are likewise advised against adding to the dictionaries the new word *ἀνταγ[ορανομήσαν]τος* in line 3 of **100**, or even its suggested alternative *ἀνταγ[ωνοθετήσαν]τος*; "Both verbs, however, are without parallel in the epigraphy of Cyprus, and for neither can I quote a foreign occurrence."

<sup>82</sup>Another such dedication on a *cippus* from the region of Kourion, but this time mentioning Apollo, is published by I. Nicolaou (*Rep. Dept. Ant. Cyprus* 1971, 70–71, no. 9 and Pl. XXIV 9): *Ἀπόλλω[ν]α Κιδε[κ]ράτης οἰκοδόμο[s] εἰ[ς] ὑχ[ήν]*; according to the theory discussed here, Apollo too must now be regarded as partaking of a "funerary capacity." On pp. 69–70, no. 7 (Pl. XXIII 7) Nicolaou publishes another *cippus* from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on which she read the remains (not verifiable on the photograph) of both a dedication to these goddesses and an epitaph, which would attest re-use of the stone.

[ή]ρωτς,<sup>83</sup> to which the editor cited as parallel an epitaph of a ἡρως ἄωρόβιος from Soloi.<sup>84</sup>

149 The copy of Menardos (our only record of this epitaph) offers Δημήτρης as the name of the dead man; there is no reason to "correct" this to Δημήτρι(ε), since Δημήτρης not Δημήτριος was the man's name.<sup>85</sup>

163 This tile in the Metropolitan Museum, attributed by Cesnola to both Kourion and Kition (and hence of doubtful provenance) is published by Mitford with the text λε and the comment, "all editors have assumed these letters to be syllabic." In fact, Masson<sup>86</sup> states of this text that it is "non repris" in his collection. Mitford offers an explanation of the alphabetic text: "We are reminded of Plutarch [*Praec.reipub.ger.* 15] as ἐπιμελητής at Chaeronea devoting many hours to the counting of tiles."<sup>87</sup> Mitford continues, "Even if every thirty-fifth tile only were numbered, that would help." Quite aside from the curious idea of numbering only every thirty-fifth tile, it is difficult to understand how a large quantity of tiles, each numbered 35, could have served any useful purpose.

It is also difficult to understand why this object was included in *IKourion*, since among the categories of documents said (p. 1) to be excluded is that of mason's marks. Although the tile is placed among the inscriptions of Roman date, the editor admits that the letter forms could equally well be Hellenistic.<sup>88</sup> Since the provenance is not certain, the text belongs in any case in the section entitled "Dubia and Spuria," on which see below.

166 On this sherd inscribed with the name Ἐρπιδίου, Mitford remarks that "Dr. Tod points out that Ἐρπιδίου = Ἐλπιδίου, and refers me to G. Dunst, *SB Ak.Berlin* 1960 (1): p. 48." On the replacement of lambda by rho attested here a more enlightening reference would have been *Bull.épigr.* 1959, 161 with the bibliography cited there and, correcting an error in the article of Dunst, *Bull.épigr.* 1961, 315.

<sup>83</sup>*Rep.Dept.Ant.Cyprus* 1971, 68–69 no. 6 and Pl. XXIV 6.

<sup>84</sup>This text is re-edited and explained by J. and L. Robert, *Bull.épigr.* 1966, 482 (but not cited in *IKourion*).

<sup>85</sup>Some of the other onomastic remarks in this part of the work are peculiar: Ἀδάμας in 154 is not solely a "Hellenistic" name: it suffices to turn to the *Namenbuch* to find an example from the fourth century A.D. Mitford himself comments on his restoration of the obscure fragments 145 that "the names of these Roman citizens are odd."

<sup>86</sup>*Inscr.chyp.syll.*, p. 407.

<sup>87</sup>This is not accurate: Plutarch did not actually count the tiles himself, but watched them being measured out; his words are κεράμῳ παρέστηκα διαμετρομένῳ (in the Loeb translation by H. N. Fowler, "standing and watching tiles being measured"); the verb διαμετρέω does not mean "count."

<sup>88</sup>Apparently no archaeologist was consulted regarding the type of the tile; cf. however the typical tiles illustrated and discussed by Scranton, 5–6, and dated by him to the Trajanic period.

**167–200** We cannot here devote the necessary space to a discussion of the treatment given to these tiny fragments in *IKourion*. These editions are marked by the same quality of texts, restorations, and commentaries as those of the fragments discussed earlier. The restored attestations of various members of imperial families, which Mitford ascribes to causes such as Kourion's devotion to the Severans, are in reality only fabrications.

The section following the inscriptions of the Roman period is entitled "The Early Byzantine Inscriptions" and contains sixteen documents. In a page of introduction, Mitford emphasizes the insignificance of Kourion after the early fourth century and its poverty from the end of that century onwards, comparing this situation with the contemporary opulence of Salamis.<sup>89</sup> The importance of this period for the epigraphy of Kourion may be further reduced by the observation that most of the inscriptions designated as "early Byzantine" are in fact not Byzantine at all, nor even Christian, but simply belong to the period of the late Roman Empire. This is true for example of the scraps **209**<sup>90</sup> and **210**,<sup>91</sup> whereas **213** (inscribed on the opposite face of **171**) does not preserve a single complete letter. Fragment **211**, a plaque found in the Sanctuary of Apollo with the letters ENXP (which have in their forms nothing characteristic of the "fourth or fifth centuries A.D." as opposed to the two preceding centuries), is restored to read 'Εν Χρ[ιστοῦ ὀνόματι? - -] with the comment that "if this fragment has been correctly interpreted . . . it would suggest the dedication or the rededication of some structure in the Apollo Sanctuary for the use of the new faith; and as such would constitute our latest—and our only Christian—document from this site."<sup>92</sup>

In view of the complete absence of Christian documents from the

<sup>89</sup>Contrast the view expressed by J. F. Daniel, *UPMB* 13.3 (1948) 8: although Kourion "was destroyed by an earthquake in the fourth century of the Christian era, even after this the city was rebuilt on a nearby site and was a place of wealth through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance."

<sup>90</sup>Although the editor dates this piece to the "fourth or fifth century A.D.?" he admits that "we must ask whether the connection of no. **209** with the Basilica is not in fact secondary; and the inscription, included here chiefly from its discovery in that building, may possibly belong to the late third or the early fourth century of our era." In fact there is nothing in the lettering of this fragment to support a classification of it as "early Byzantine;" on the other hand the close resemblance claimed with the letter forms of **178** is illusory.

<sup>91</sup>The editor states that "No. 210 is ascribed to the fourth or fifth century, partly from its discovery in the Basilica, chiefly from the quality of the lettering [nothing in the "quality" of the four preserved letters imposes such a late dating]. But an earlier date and secondary association with this building can by no means be excluded."

<sup>92</sup>Mitford, however, admits that "as evidence no. 211 must be treated with reserve," for there is no evidence to indicate repair or even occupation of the sanctuary in the period to which he assigns this text.

Sanctuary of Apollo, and indeed of the absence there of any document whatsoever from the "early Byzantine period," it seems both unnecessary and unwise to ascribe to these four letters such far-reaching religious importance and such a late date; instead—assuming for the sake of argument that it is at all worthwhile to provide an interpretation of this scrap—one might rather see in these letters the end (for example) of the preposition *ἐνεκεν* (preceded by an abstract noun in the genitive) and the beginning of a participle such as *χρ[ίσαντες]*, or alternatively an aorist termination (for instance) in the third person singular and a noun *χρ[ῖς]* or *χρ[ίσματα]*: not Jesus Christ, but "wall-plaster."<sup>93</sup> Excluding the mosaics, the only Christian inscriptions in this section are thus **214–216**, of which the first two are apparently repetitive fragments of an identical text connected by Mitford with the baptistry of the basilica,<sup>94</sup> whereas the third has only the letters *ἀμή[ν]*.

Likewise most of the inscriptions on mosaic<sup>95</sup> are not necessarily evidence for the Christianity of their owners. This is true of **201**, in the vestibule: *εἶσα[γε] ἐπ' ἀγαθ[ῶ] εὐτυχῶς τῷ οἴκῳ*<sup>96</sup> and equally true of **203**,

<sup>93</sup>For inscriptions mentioning such wall-plaster, see L. and J. Robert, *La Carie* 2.363–364; and for *ἐχρευσ[εν]* and *χρε[ίσματα]* on a similar fragment of a marble plaque at Didyma with "hässliche Schrift der späten Kaiserzeit" see L. Robert, *Hellenica* 11–12 (Paris 1960) 460–461.

<sup>94</sup>*IKourion* gives for **215**, the better preserved of these twin documents, the following text:

- - - τος ἐφύγατω - - -  
- - - θ]ω κ(αι) ἐσώθη - - -

The editor offers no explanation of the meaning of this text. Above the theta of the word *θ(ε)ῶ* in **214** and above the omega of the same word in **215** is engraved a horizontal line which is to be interpreted as a mark of abbreviation; the same sign appears also above the eta of *ἐσώθη(ν)*. The form *ἐφύγατω* is peculiar (the first letter in this line must be dotted, since Mitford himself comments that "something of the horizontal stroke of either gamma or tau is legible"). I. Ševčenko suggests instead the following text: *[π]ροσέφυγα τῷ [θ](ε)ῶ κ(αι) ἐσώθη(ν)*. If Mitford's reading is correct, alternatives are *-τος* or *-γος* *ἐφυγα*. A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar* (London 1897) 202 par. 794–795, points out that the form *ἐφυγα* (aorist) is current in the present day, citing several examples in later Greek. Cf. also S. B. Psaltes, *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken* (Göttingen 1913) 209–210.

<sup>95</sup>Cf. J. F. Daniel, *UPMB* 13.3 (1948) 12 (on the Palace): "its chief glory lies in the mosaic floors of the main apartments . . . Even more important than the artistic aspects of the mosaics are the inscriptions which are worked into them." The designation "Palace" was later abandoned by the excavators in favor of the appellation "Annex of Eustolios."

<sup>96</sup>Dots beneath uncertain letters and iota subscript were omitted in *IKourion*. For the restoration Mitford hesitated (p. 353 n. 2) between *ἐπ' ἀγαθ[ῶ]* and *ἐπ' ἀγαθ[ῆ] τύχη]*; the latter is impossible here. In addition to the bibliography cited for this document it may be observed that a photograph of the inscription was published in *UPMB* 14.4 (1950) Pl. VII.

which consists of two lines of verse<sup>97</sup> mentioning an ἐξέδρην θάλαμόν τε θυῶ[δεα]<sup>98</sup> which Αἰδῶ(ς) Σωφροσύνη τε καὶ [Εὐνομίη]<sup>99</sup> κομέουσιν; and it is likewise true of 204, a mutilated epigram celebrating a certain Eustolios λουτρὰ χαρισσάμενος.<sup>100</sup> G. H. McFadden summarized the contents of this inscription as follows: "Someone, perhaps Eustolios, forgot to fulfil a promise, but Arakaites seems to have adjusted the matter." In *IKourion*, on the other hand, this text is presented as follows:

[Κουριέας] τὸ πάροιβεν [ἐν δλβ]φ παντὶ πέλοντας  
[δυστηνοὺς ἐσιδ]ῶν ἐκ ποδὸς Εὐστόλιος  
[οὐ πατέρων χώ]ρης ἐπελήσατο· ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ τῆς  
4 [ἡμετέρας πόλε]ως λουτρὰ χαρισσάμενος,  
[αὐτὸς δὴ τοτ' ἐ]δίξετο Κούριον, ὥς ποτε Φοῖβος  
[ἤρχετο, καὶ] ψυχρὴν θῆκεν ὑπνηεμένην.

We must first of all observe that in many places these readings are unjustifiable. In line 1 Mitford prints *πάροιβεν*, but in his own facsimile (p. 357) he declares that he saw ΠΑΡΩ (each of these letters appears on this facsimile as visible in full and completely certain). After the end of this word Mitford's facsimile displays a lacuna of three letters (the number is indicated) before the letters ΠΑΝ, but he prints in his text a restoration of five letters plus a certain (undotted) omega which nowhere appears on the facsimile.<sup>101</sup> The text of this line therefore presents an inaccurate and unacceptable picture of what is actually preserved.

<sup>97</sup>From the bibliography cited in the lemma for this inscription should be deleted G. F. Hill, *History of Cyprus* 1.250, n. 1, who does not even mention this text. A reference should however have been added to the photograph published in *UPMB* 14.4 (1950) Pl. VII (where it is described as the "morality inscription"). Mitford's reference to his own article *Opus Arch* 6 (1950) 47, n. 1 is really superfluous, since the note in question does no more than mention the existence at Kourion of "four texts . . . illustrating the transition from paganism to Christianity."

<sup>98</sup>It is worth citing the Homeric sources: *Od.* 4.121 θαλάμοιο θυῶδεος; *Hymn to Demeter* 244, 288 θυῶδεος ἐκ θαλάμοιο.

<sup>99</sup>This restoration (in a text of the "late fourth century A.D.?" ) was suggested by M. N. Tod on the basis of passages in Thucydides and Aristotle. But *εὐνομίη* is the "justice" of governors and high officials (cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 4.97-98 and 107)—hardly appropriate for what McFadden (*UPMB* 7.2 [1938] 10) called "the 'thalamon', or women's quarters."

<sup>100</sup>From the bibliography cited for this inscription should once again be deleted the reference to Hill, *History of Cyprus* 1.250, n. 1, which in no way concerns this text; and once again there should be a reference to the photograph published in *UPMB* 14.4 (1950) Pl. VII.

<sup>101</sup>Mitford prints without dots, and therefore as certain, also the last two letters of *παντὶ*, despite the fact that neither his facsimile of his own readings, nor the drawing (on p. 356) of the whole inscription, nor the photograph on the same page, nor the other photograph published in *UPMB* shows anything but the bottom strokes of these letters, which could therefore equally well be interpreted in other ways; the same is true of the

The restorations are equally unacceptable: the contrast between [ἐν δλβ]φ and [δυστηνοὺς] is simply an invention without the slightest support in the words that remain; and the words that are actually preserved, ἐκ ποδός, are left without any construction, simply hanging in the air.<sup>102</sup> A restoration attempting to approximate the thought of the original must begin from the opposite starting point: instead of inventing a "suitable" theme *ex nihilo* it is necessary to begin with an analysis of what is preserved, in order to fix the sense in so far as possible. Thus here a restoration must not ignore the words ἐκ ποδός but rather use them as the base of the interpretation. Since not enough is preserved of the first line to render possible an analysis of its meaning, and since the whole beginning of the second line is lost, the correct course here is to abstain from restoration.

In line 6 the "visit of Phoebus" depends on a restoration as arbitrary as the hypotheses concerning visits to Kourion on the part of Trajan and Hadrian (111 and 85). The Christian character of this inscription, assumed without any question by the excavators,<sup>103</sup> has no basis in fact; equally imaginary is the little romance set forth on page 357: "My restorations are offered in the main *exempli gratia*."<sup>104</sup> The meaning of this poem, nevertheless, is not obscure. Eustolios, although he lived abroad—and possibly had risen in Imperial service—when he saw the miseries of Kourion, did not forget the city of his birth. First he presented these baths; and then, visiting the city in person (as once did Phoebus),<sup>105</sup> built for her this cool shelter from the winds." (This is Mitford's interpretation of ψυχρὴν ὑπηρεμίην; but both B. H. Hill and J. F. Daniel read a zeta as the

---

doubtful lambda in πέλοντας (printed in *IKourion* without a dot) and (perhaps) of the rho in πάροιθεν (the latter word is very suspect).

<sup>102</sup>Unfortunately the editor chose not to risk a translation, so it is impossible to determine how he understood these words in the context he created.

<sup>103</sup>Cf. McFadden, *UPMB* 7.2 (1938) 10: the inscription "couples with [the name of Kourion] the name of its chief god of pagan days, in such a way as to indicate that although his glory has been surpassed it has not yet been forgotten." Thus also DeCoursey Fales *UPMB* 14.4 (1950) 33: "One may safely conclude that [this text] mentioned the founding of the baths and supplicated the Christian God to take care of Kourion as once did Phoebus Apollo . . . a pagan god was in a formal inscription respectfully mentioned *beside the Christian*" (our italics; there follows a commentary on the gradual transition at Kourion from paganism to Christianity).

<sup>104</sup>Cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 7 (Paris 1949) 180: such restorations of epigrams are entertaining games but have nothing to do with scholarship, and new fragments of restored epigrams regularly disprove proposed restorations of this sort; cf. *Bull. épigr.* 1949, 50.

<sup>105</sup>The "visit" of Eustolios is here compared to the "visit" of Phoebus just as the Christian God was opposed to Phoebus Apollo by DeCoursey Fales—with equal lack of verisimilitude, for the restoration [αὐτὸς ἐ]δίξετο Κούριον ("he searched for Kourion") is excluded in this context. It is worthy of note that McFadden *UPMB* 7.2 (1938) 10 understood this verb to mean "protects (?)."

first letter, and the upper right corner of this zeta appears both on the drawing published by Mitford<sup>106</sup> and on the photograph;<sup>107</sup> the word *ψυχρὴν* is highly suspect.) Each assertion in this discussion is erroneous: there is no evidence that Eustolios lived abroad or anywhere but at Kourion; his imperial service is simply an invention; the miseries of Kourion are another fiction; and the restoration *καὶ τῆς [ἡμετέρας πόλε]ως λουτρὰ χαρισσάμενος* is unacceptable: although M. N. Tod "points out that... after *χαρισσάμενος* a dative rather than a genitive is to be expected" (p. 357, n. 2), Mitford evidently was not convinced. He assumes that *ὕπνημιλη* (attested elsewhere only as an adjective) is here employed for the first time as a noun; others may prefer to understand it here too as an adjective and assume that the noun to which it refers stood in the first portion of this line. In sum, both the claimed readings of doubtful letters and the unsupported restorations<sup>108</sup> must be rejected, here as in the other documents which we have studied.

Of the other documents in this section, **205** is a representation of the allegorical figure *Κτίσις* within a medallion<sup>109</sup> (the inscription is disposed in one line, not in two as it is presented in Mitford's text); **206** is a fragment preserving only a few letters; and **207** is a depiction of the discovery of Achilles on Skyros, with inscriptions identifying the person-

<sup>106</sup>The name of the individual responsible for this drawing is nowhere revealed. This is not merely a matter of moral justice, the awarding of credit where credit is due; for the fact that the editor chose to print this drawing means that he intended it to serve as contributing to the establishment of the text, and under such circumstances it is of the greatest importance to know who was responsible for the drawing which we are asked to regard as evidence: was it the work of an anonymous draftsman or of a practised epigraphist? Also it is not explained why this drawing is defaced by the numeral 204b written in heavy black characters over the Greek letters (204 is the number of this document in the corpus).

<sup>107</sup>Other letters in this word which are presented as certain are also in fact badly damaged or entirely unverifiable on the photograph.

<sup>108</sup>In the course of our commentary we have had occasion to reject the restorations proposed for each line of this document except line 3; but this supplement is no better than the others. Mitford comments (357, n. 2), "Dr. Tod points out that alternatives to *πατέρων* are *πατρικῆς* and *πατριῆς*;" in fact there are many other words of the requisite metrical value which could equally well be substituted here, but there is no reason (and none is advanced) why we must select from this abundance precisely [*πατέρων* *χώ*]ρης. On the contrary, one may remain extremely skeptical of the assertion that what Eustolios forgot or did not forget was "the land of his fathers."

<sup>109</sup>To the bibliography (one item) cited here for this "unpublished" inscription should be added the photograph which appeared in *UPMB* 14.4 (1950) 36, Pl. VIII (on 34 DeCoursey Fales remarked that "this name is best interpreted as 'Founding Spirit'"); furthermore the text was transcribed by this scholar in *AJA* 54 (1950) 129; more recent photographs of this mosaic (after restoration) may be found in *BCH* 95 (1971) 430 fig. 147 (cf. 432 no. 2) and *AJA* 76 (1972) pl. 68, fig. 51 (cf. pp. 319-320), and an older photograph is even in Kevork A. Keshishian, *Romantic Cyprus* (4th ed., Nicosia 1951) 82 (brought to our notice by K. Rigsby).

nages.<sup>110</sup> One is astonished to read (p. 360) that "this mosaic is unique at Kourion for its portrayal of a purely pagan scene," for the following mosaic 208 is a depiction of the rape of Ganymede by the eagle (with the letters ΦΡΤ)! There is no reason to believe that any of these inscriptions expresses the Christian faith or deserves to be classified as "early Byzantine," any more than the two fine inscribed polychrome mosaics found on the acropolis of Kourion which depict combats of gladiators (neither of these mosaics is included in *IKourion*).<sup>111</sup>

The only inscribed mosaic with an unequivocally Christian text is 202,<sup>112</sup> which mentions the *πολύλλιτα σήματα Χριστοῦ*<sup>113</sup> and is dated by Mitford to the "late fourth century A.D."<sup>114</sup> But there is nothing in this

<sup>110</sup>One of the figures is identified as *Δηει[δ]αμία* (a comparison of the photograph reveals that both alphas should be dotted; Mitford himself comments that "only the tip of the first *alpha* survives"), thus accented, with the following note: "in place of the normal spelling *Δηιδάμεια*. Cf., however, Bechtel, *Personennamen*, pp. 385 ff." It is true that this mosaic, by an extremely common phenomenon of iotacism, has *Δηει[δ]άμια* for *Δηιδάμεια*, with interchange of *ει* and *ι*; but in what way does this justify transferral of the accent to the penultimate syllable? (The name is accented *Δηειδαμία* again in the commentary.) The reference to "Bechtel, *Personennamen*, pp. 385 f." does nothing to elucidate this matter; for on pp. 385 f. of the work cited Bechtel discusses names beginning with the prepositions *προ-* and *προσ-* and with the prefix *πρωτο-* (on pp. 122 and 579 of this work Bechtel registers *Δηιδάμεια*, naturally with this accent). One suspects that the editor may have intended to refer to p. 285 of Pape-Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Brunswick 1884); but here too the name is cited, with various attestations, as *Δηιδάμεια*. Why is this citation introduced here with "however," as though the work referred to provided some reason to believe that *Δηειδάμια* is not in fact a variant spelling of *Δηιδάμεια*? The treatment of this name suffers from some confusion.

<sup>111</sup>Photographs and texts in V. Karageorghis, *BCH* 92 (1968) 346-349 and figs. 134-135; cf. K. Nicolaou, *Archaeology in Cyprus* (Supplement to *JHS*) 1969, 50 fig. 18 (a photograph of the first mosaic, with transcriptions of both texts). One mosaic shows a pair of fighting gladiators and gives their names, *Μαργαρείτης* and *Ἑλληνικός*, while the other depicts an umpire called *Δαρείος* between the gladiators *Αντρῶς* and *Ε[- -]* (there is another mutilated inscription below the latter figures).

<sup>112</sup>From the bibliography cited in the lemma should be removed the reference to Hill, *History of Cyprus* 1.250, n. 1, an inaccurate summary of the contents of this inscription (after *UPMB* 1938) which contributes nothing.

<sup>113</sup>The editor comments that "*πολύλλιστος* is to be found in Kallimachos for the Homeric *πολύλλιστος*" (information derived without acknowledgement from *LSJ*); more relevant than this citation from a Hellenistic poet is an epigraphic attestation of this word to be found in L. Robert, *Doc. de l'Asie Mineure mérid.* 92: *ὄρσει δὲ πολύλλιστον εὐοχθείαν*, in an oracle of Claros at Syedra published precisely (without recognition of the oracle's provenance) by Mitford and G. E. Bean. For another epigraphic example at Anasartha-Theodoroupolis in Syria see *Hellenica* 4.136: *πολύλλιστον ἄνθετο νῆδμ* (a Homeric imitation in a Christian text).

<sup>114</sup>According to J. F. Daniel, *UPMB* 7.2 (1938) 13, "This inscription seems to date from the very beginning of the fourth century of the Christian era, and is probably the earliest known monumental record of Christianity in the Greek world." Cf. however at Kourion itself 150 (first published in 1900), a crypto-Christian epitaph with chi tilted to

inscribed profession of faith to justify the conclusion that "the absence of Christian symbolism . . . hints that the conversion of Kourion was a matter of convenience." On the contrary, such an attitude of lofty disdain is incomprehensible in the face of this attestation of fervent faith on the part of those who chose to have inscribed in mosaic the following text:

'Αντὶ λίθων μεγάλων, ἀντὶ στερεοῦ σιδήρου  
χαλκοῦ τε ξανθοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ ἀντ' ἀδάμαντος  
(ο)ἶδε δόμοι ζῶσαντο πολύλλιστα σήματα Χριστοῦ.

The section devoted to the so-called "early Byzantine" inscriptions is followed by one entitled "Addenda" which is organized according to much the same principles as the preceding chapters. Two of the texts here are syllabic, a previously unpublished inscription on a silver bowl in the Cesnola Collection at the Metropolitan Museum which had gone unnoticed until a recent cleaning, and an inscribed block found on the Acropolis of Kourion in 1962.<sup>115</sup> The third text is a Latin stamp (known already from Syria and Egypt) on the rim of a large mortar with the name *Alexandri Lada*,<sup>116</sup> and the fourth is three stones with the inscription ΠΑ thought to have been connected with the lid to Apollo's treasury.<sup>117</sup> The fifth and last<sup>118</sup> is a text, apparently complete, on a "fragment of a block of coarse and gritty limestone" read as *τόκῳ χη'* and interpreted as "a sgraffito concerned with usury? First or second century A.D."<sup>119</sup> Mitford translates this enigmatic document as follows: "for or by interest: 608" but makes no attempt to explain it or to determine why one should want to erect such an inscription. Study of the photograph, however, reveals that almost none of the "hastily cut" letters is complete: in fact this is a series of scratches which have no meaning.

---

make a cross, which is dated by Mitford (on the basis of the letter forms reported by Walters) to the "second century A.D.?" (with the admission that "the apparent date of the present inscription is astonishing"). In his commentary on the tilted chi Mitford refers to an article of W. M. Calder which appeared in 1924 but fails to cite the discussion by the same scholar in *AnatStud* 5 (1955) 35-36.

<sup>115</sup>Neither of the two previous editions of the latter document listed in the lemma (one by Mitford himself) is registered in the Concordance of Publications on 397-398. To the bibliography cited add *SEG* 23 (1968) 630.

<sup>116</sup>For this name the editor refers to "Pape-Benseler s.v.; Preisigke s.v.; H. Seyrig *BCH* 63 (1939): p. 260." However the article in question is not by H. Seyrig but by W. Lameere; and Lameere in the passage cited refers only to Pape-Benseler and to Preisigke.

<sup>117</sup>There is a photograph of only one of the three stones which bear this inscription, an unfortunate omission since they are dated uniquely on the basis of the letter forms (not even the height of the letters is given for the two inscriptions that are not illustrated).

<sup>118</sup>Since this stone was "discovered on 24 November, 1949" one wonders why it is classified in the *Addenda*.

<sup>119</sup>The reason why this date was chosen is not explained.

After these *addenda* are listed two more documents under the heading "Dubia and Spuria," which is curious, since neither of these items, an agate scarab and a cornelian ring-stone, is regarded by the editor or by anyone else as a forgery or even as of doubtful authenticity. What has been questioned in each of these cases is the provenance, and in the case of the scarab Mitford concludes in favor of Kourion. One wonders therefore why it was not included in the body of the text like the rock crystal ring-stone published as 27. In his previous publication of 223, a fine gem with a bearded head surrounded by mysterious letters, Mitford had included this document among the inscriptions of Kourion.<sup>120</sup> Furthermore, one reads on page 388 of *IKourion* that "a glance at these signs . . . will suggest that they have been included simply to give an atmosphere of age and mystery."<sup>121</sup> . . . We may, therefore, safely ignore the  $\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\ \tau\acute{o}(\nu)\delta\epsilon$  'Αμυκλῶ of Hall, regret that this should appear in the *Handbook* [of the *Cesnola Collection*] as  $(\xi)\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\ \tau\acute{o}(\nu)\delta\epsilon$  'Αμυκλῶ and deplore its bold survival until 1956 as an unquestioned  $\xi\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\ \tau\acute{o}(\nu)\delta\epsilon$  'Αμυκλῶ." It is astonishing that the editor does not mention here among these interpretations that must thus be ignored, regretted, and deplored his own earlier interpretation " $\theta\epsilon\delta\delta?$  sa. te. RA. TE. lo" of 1961,<sup>122</sup> accompanied by a facsimile (Pl. XIV 6) which differs in almost every letter from the facsimile published in *IKourion*.<sup>123</sup> One suspects that Mitford's complete, but tacit, abandonment of his former position was motivated by the cogent remarks of O. Masson, *Inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques*, pp. 390 and 398; but in view of the asperity with which Mitford criticizes his predecessors, it is unfortunate that the "candid" reader can have no means of suspecting that the views presented represent a radical change from the author's own earlier assertions.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, TALLAHASSEE  
CENTER FOR HELLENIC STUDIES, WASHINGTON

<sup>120</sup>*BICS* Suppl. 10 (1961) 24-25.

<sup>121</sup>Mitford observes that G. M. A. Richter assigned this gem on stylistic grounds to the period of the early Roman Empire.

<sup>122</sup>On this (n. 120 above) he commented as follows: "I thus add [*sic*] lower horizontals to the 2nd, 5th, and 6th signs [but each of these signs is quite clear, without the horizontals on the photograph in *IKourion*]. It is indeed possible that we had te. | sa. te. JA. RI. lo |—but the first diacritical mark is most improbable [it is]. For  $\searrow = ri$ , however, cf. our No. 4 above."

<sup>123</sup>Mitford states (n. 120, above), 23, that for his facsimile published there he was "entirely dependent upon Cesnola."