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NOTES ON INSCRIPTIONS FROM KONYA

The inscriptions of the Konya Archaeological Museum have recently been edited with translation and brief commentary by B. H. McLean (hereafter M.), *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor, IV: Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Konya Archaeological Museum* (BIAA monograph 29, 2002), including around 136 inedita.¹ Here I offer textual suggestions on some of the more notable documents.

8.

Ζιοκομητῶν δήμος κατὰ [ - - - ]
πρὸς θεῶν Ζιζιμηνῆς ἐπὶ [πέωξ - - - ]
ἐντος, ἐπιμελητῶν Παδοῦ Εὐμενεδήμου, [ - - - ]
δήμος Παπα, Ἑγνάτιος Διομήδους, ΠΑΣΔ [ - - - ]

In ll. 1–2, read [Μη]τρός θεῶν. The tau is quite clear on both the photograph of the stone at fig. 9, and that of the squeeze at fig. 11. At the end of the line, EΠΙΕ is an error of transcription: the spacing and letter traces require EΠΙ. E[ - - ]. The missing letter could be a sigma; iota is excluded. Presumably an eponymous magistrate; ἐπὶ στέ[φαινηρόου] is not impossible, although the sigma and tau would be squeezed very close together. In line 3, Εὐμενεδήμου is an error of transcription: read Παδοῦ Μενεδήμου. The name Menedemos occurs on coins of Iconium: H. von Aulock, *Münzen und Städte Lykaoniens* (Tübingen, 1976), 75–6. It is hard to judge how much is missing to right; at least one more epimeletes in the genitive is required in l. 3, before the series of names in the nominative begins.

18.

Ἀπα[ς]
Εἰροῦ Δ[ι M-]
ἐγίστῳ ἐυ[χίν]
[ - - - - - - - - ]

The metronymic is very unlikely and Εἰροῦ is not the genitive of Εἰρίς. Read Ἀπα[ς Μ]ἐἱροῦ: the name is attested several times at Iconium. The line division Μἐἱροῦ is unproblematic with Μεγίστῳ following.

¹ For no. 203 (‘unpublished’), see G. Laminger-Pascher, *Beiträge zu den griechischen Inschriften Lykaoniens* (Wien, 1984), no. 153. Nos. 146, 188, 189 have also been published independently; see SEG XLVII (1997) 1824, 1831, 1830. On 228 see below.
25.

Της ΠΑΡΘΕ
ΚΑΙ Δικαίω
(έ)χήν.


Rather I suggest that the inscription is best explained as one of a pair of altars established to Hosios and Dikaios, set side by side to read:

I
[ὅ δείκων -] [name ending in] -της Παρθε-
(e.g.) νίαν Ὅσὺν
έυ-

II
καὶ Δικαίω
-χήν

If correct, this explanation would be of significance for the unity/duality of the deity or deities concerned: M. Ricl, EA 19 (1992) 71–102, esp. 93–95.

51.

Λ. Α[ἵ]λιος Πρ[ίσ-]
κος Πατρο[κλ-]
οὔς υἱό[ς]
κ(α)ί Αἰλία
5 ἀτὰ γυν[ὴ]
ἐχευτοῦς κτλ.

Insufficient consideration is given to the space to be filled at right, where a large part of the face has broken off (see fig. 68). Read Λ. Αἰλίας Πρ[είσ]κος Πατρο[κλ]ίους υἱό[ς καὶ Λου]ξία Αἰλία . [c. 4–5]αίο ἀνου [αὐτοῦ] ἐχευτοῦς κτλ. Ailia’s name is of the form Δικαίω, Ἐρμαιω vel sim.

56.

Lines 9–11:

... κῆδει ἐπ’ ἀλγινοῦτι δάμης δυ-νῃσίσα(ν) προμοίρας, ἰ ὁ φθόν· ἐνείκησας,
με καὶ ἣν πόθου ἐμάρανες.
Erroneous word-division. Read δάμης διμηθείσα προμοίρας· ὁ φθόν·, ἐνεύκησάς | με καὶ ἢν ἐποθοῦ ἐμάρανες· For the theme of the epitaph, see e.g. Peek, *Gr. Vers-Inschr.* I 1732 = Merkelbach–Stauber, Steinepigramme III 14/13/05 (Issaura Nova).

Ll. 1–3, Ὁνομάζετ(sic) τὴν Ἐρμήνιοι κτα. In line 2 the stone clearly reads ΕΡΠΗ, with space for a further letter at line end. The son’s name is Ἐρπη[α]; the name Ἐρπτας is epichoric, characteristic of Lycia/Pisidia; see G. H. R. Horsley, *AS* 42 (1992), 128. The stone is broken at bottom; the imprecation ought no doubt to be supplemented ἐξεί Μὴνα κ[α]τοχθόνι[ον κεχολαμένον], the same word-order as E. Lane, *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis* I nos. 145 and 150. I take the opportunity to correct a fragmentary imprecation from Tyriaion, *I. Sultan Daği* (*IGSK* 62) 342, where Jonnes prints:

```
έαν (sic) ΠΟΤΟΥ
to ΤΑΜΟ
κακον ΤΥΗ
ΣΕΙΣ... ΕΙΜΗΝ
5 κατά... ΘΩΝΙ
donκέ... ΩΛΩ
μενον
```


Another Hermes-derived name can be corrected at *I. Pisid. Cent.* (*IGSK* 57) 59. The editors print ll. 1–5 as follows:

```
Ἑρμαῖς Ἀπολλω-
νίου καὶ Τατας ΠΡ
ΟΦΑ... Ω
τοῦ ἐποιήσ-
5 αν κτα.
```

The photograph scarcely supports the reading Ἐρμαῖς in l. 1: read, no doubt, Ἀυ[η]ρ ῖῆλις: the same spelling in *I. Pisid. Cent.* 55. In ll. 2–3, the edd. comment ‘We take this to be the patronymic, crudely added on the left and right edges’. Rather the letters printed in majuscule are simply the beginning and end of l. 2: read Ἀπολλωφάντου καὶ Τατας Πρώτου.

96.

A line omitted from the transcription, making nonsense of the text. Read Αὐρ. Ὁνένκλητος | Οὐδενοῦστο | κε Αὐρ. Δόμνα | Αὐρ. Ματίη | θυγατρί μνήμης | χάριν.
99.

P. J. Thonemann

Oυρ(δ)ιος ἀνέστησεν Γοῦδει[α-]
[ν]ὲν γυνέκα αὐτοῦ, Μα[.]]
[.](γ) ἀδελφὸ(ν), (<κ>ή Ουρδιουα(ν)

(Left Centre Right)
ΣΕ ΝΓΟΥΔ ΕI

‘Ourdios erected (this image of) Goundeiane, his wife, for [So-and-so], (his) brother, and for Ourdioua...’

The corrections offered by M. are arbitrary. His description of the relief (‘Head of female figure carved in relief between flat columns, surrounded by domestic utensils and vine (?)’) leads us to suppose that the inscription commemorates a single individual. In the absence of a photograph of the stone, it is hard to tell exactly how much text is missing above or below, left or right. Exempli gratia I suggest:

[[Π]οὐβλιος ἀνέστησεν Γοῦδει[α-]
[ν]ὲν γυνέκα αὐτοῦ· Μα[.]
[.]ζ ἀδελφὸς Πουβλίου ἀ[ντ]-
[τη]ς ἰοῦ Γοῦδει-
[ανέν].

In line 3, the letter which M. reads as an eta is a pi with central cross-bar.

114.

Ll. 3–10 are printed by M. thus:

[.]ΛΕ
ΠΙΣ
5 τυ
γατ-
[ρ]ός
αῦ-
[τοῦ]
10 [.]ΡΙΝΗΣΜΩΝΑΧΗΣ καὶ Α[- ca.3 -]ης τοῦ Θ(εο)ῦ
[- ca.3 -]ΕΘΑΝΑΤΗΝΟΣΚΩΝΤΕΣ εὐχ(ην).

The inscription is Christian. In lines 3–4, read [.],KE I [,].ΤΙΣ: I have no restoration to suggest. [. ]πινης preserves the end of the girl’s name. She was a μωσχῆς καὶ δ[οῦ]λης τοῦ Θ(εο)ῦ, ‘nun and slave of God’. In what follows, ΑΝΑΓΗΝΟΣΚΩΝΤΕΣ presumably derives from ἀναγι(γ)νώσκο, ‘you who read this’. εὐχ(ην) is senseless. One would willingly restore εὐχ[ηθ]e vel sim.: L. Robert, Hellenica I (Limoges, 1940), 33–36.
M. offers text and translation as follows.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{μνήμη} & \text{' ἀλόχω} \\
\text{Φιλίη} & \text{' Ἀγαθῆς [ē-]} \\
\text{τευξεν} & \text{κ ὡ ΩΜΟ[.]} \\
\text{ΑΤΝΗ} & \text{ν. καὶ θυγάτηρ[ρ]} \\
\text{5} & \text{Μαξιμῆς, ΜΗΣ[.]} \\
\text{[.]ΗΝΟΥΝ[ca. t–2]} & \text{ΚΑΠΑ[. ]} \\
\text{TANE[.]ΧΕΝΟΜΟ[,]σ–} \\
\text{[.]ωφροσύνη ἄρε–} \\
\text{τής τήν ἐξοχά–} \\
\text{10} & \text{[v] πασῶν.}
\end{align*}\]

'Monument to a wife. Philie Agathis made (this) and [So-and-so], and (her) daughter, Maximina, … [for So-and-so], who was prudent, pre-eminent among all women in virtue.'

The epitaph consists of three reasonably accurate hexameters. Read:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{μνήμη} & \text{' ἀλόχω} \\
\text{φιλίη} & \text{' Ἀγαθῆς} \\
\text{τευξεν} & \text{κ ὡ Ωμο[φ–]} \\
\text{ἀντη} & \text{καὶ θυγάτηρ[η]} \\
\text{5} & \text{Μαξιμῆς, ὑψηλὴς χ[ά–]} \\
\text{[ρ]ν, οὐν[ε]ξα πά[σ–]} \\
\text{αν [έ]σ[σ]εν ὡμο[φ–]ροσύνην ἄρε–} \\
\text{τής τήν ἐξοχά–} \\
\text{πασῶν.}
\end{align*}\]

Evidently "Ἀγαθῆς m., not Ἀγαθῆς f. No parallel presents itself for ὡμοφάτην, but it is hard to see what else could be restored here, and the metaphor is not especially difficult. In ll. 4–5, the dative θυγάτηρ[ρ] Μαξιμῆς is possible, which would give additional point to ὡμοφοροσύνη; but the singular verb ἔσεν in l. 7 militates against this.
'Memnon, erected (this) stele for Iusta Doxa, his (lit. my) beloved wife, in memory.'

Some errors of transcription and word-division. Read Μεμνόνιος τῇ γλυκυπάτῃ μου ἔγνηκέ φτέρον ἀνέστησα ιστήλην μνήμης χάριν. Confusion between 1st and 3rd person is also (erroneously) posited by Jonnes at I. Sultan Daği 32, where read presumably Παπύλος Στεφάνου ἐγέρθη ζών ἐνέστησεν.

In l. 2 the stone reads TOY. The father of Mnestheos, Timotheos and Kallimachos was named 'Ατώντου: see e.g. L. Robert, Noms indigènes dans l’Asie Mineure gréco-romaine (Paris, 1963), 528–30.

For τὴν στήλην ἐκτῇ ἔτεμε (‘cut into shape’), read naturally ἔτεξε: for the form of the letter χι, shaped like the number ‘3’, compare MAMA I 361 (phot.), l. 5 ἕτευξεν.

A line omitted from the transcription. Lines 5ff. should read τῇ γλυκυτάτῃ κὲ πολυποθινοντάτη συνβιν Θέκλης κὲ ἐμαυτῷ. The irrational genitive is very common, e.g. 160.6–7, τῇ συνβινίο ἀυτοῦ Ζώης; MAMA I 383, τῇ συνβινίῳ μου Θέκλης; I. Sultan Dağı 319, τῇ ἱδίᾳ θυγατρὶ Οὐκλεντίλλης; I. Sultan Dağı 327, τῇ μητρί Πρειουτὸς. This last example permits us to correct a personal name at 69.7–8; for Πρειουτὶ τ(gregator) θυγατρὶ, read Πρειουτὶ θυγατρὶ.

Lines 9–12 lay down penalties against desecrators of the tomb. … and whoever should break into (this grave) <will suffer doom (?)>, heavy with envy. He shall render an account to God. Do not wrong your God.’

ΕΠΙΣΒΙΑΣΕΤΗ represents ἐπισβιάσεται, fut. indic.: thus also βούλομαι in l. 6. The photograph of the squeeze at fig. 261 suggests the reading ΧΙΕΡΑ at the start of l. 10, i.e. χείρα with epsilon and iota reversed. Read here ὅς δὲ ἄν ἐπισβιάσητῃ ἙΠΙΣΟΣΙ ὁθ. τῶν βερούθον. The formula is extremely common: see J. Strubbe, AΡΑΙ ΕΙΠΙΤΥΜΒΙΟΙ (Bonn, 1997) (IGSK 52), App. 2.1, pp. 285–288; many exx. have the spelling ποσοθ(ε). The formula in l. 12 (which M. mistranslates) has frequently been discussed: A. Wilhelm, Griechische Grabinschriften aus Kleinasien, Akademieschriften II 336–409, at 391–403; E. Gibson, The “Christians for Christians” Inscriptions of Phrygia (Missoula, 1978), 62–63. No doubt here we should read ἀδικήσῃς[ζ]: on the grammatical confusion, see Gibson, 63.

The stone is broken at top left, but the remains of two more letters are visible: read [Ἀ]/ρ. Καλπούρνιος | [τ] ὅ ἱδιῳ πατρὶ κτλ.

The photograph of the stone at fig. 263 does not support τῶ in l. 1: the spacing requires two letters between tau and pi. We appear to have a personal name ending in -σο[ζ] or -το[ζ]. Presumably a patronymic follows, Πασιὼν[οζ], providing more plausible syntax.
Mysterious oath formula. Read π(ατέ)ρα κὲ | υ(ο)ν κὲ ζεγ(ον) πν(ευμ)α. Perusal of the photograph at fig. 264 confirms that ΠΡΑ, ΥΝ, and ΠΝΑ all carry abbreviation marks. A close parallel at Soloi in Cyprus, ὑ(ρ)κείζομεν υμᾶς τὸν Θεόν τὸν π(α)ντοκράτορα κὲ Πατέρα κὲ Υειόν κὲ τὸ Ζηγεῖον Π(ε)νεῦμα (T. B. Mitford, Byzantion 20 (1950) 165-167; cf. D. Feissel, BCH 104 (1980) 464). Closer to Konya, I. Sultan Daği 50 (Philomelion) 11–14, εἰσχύσε | πρὸς πατέραν καὶ υειόν κὲ ζηγεῖον πνεῦμα. Tangentially, the name of the ἐπείσκοπος in ll. 6–7 of the Philomelian inscription (Ἐπείσκοπων) is very implausible: the photo is unhelpful, but seems to permit the reading Γρηγορείον.

Although not unparalleled with personal names, the definite article frequently precedes specification of family relationship. Hence read ὄν[εςτη]σα τὸ | πατρι | Λουκα(ίω) Εὐρέτ[τε] | π[ρεσβ(ητε)ρ]ο. Presumably the son’s name was also [Εὐ]ρετος. For the name, see A. Wilhelm, Akademieschriften III 1; MAMA VII 224, 238.

The lettering of the inscription is extremely distinctive. For a very close parallel, conceivably even the same mason, see MAMA I 218. The abbreviation πρεβ = πρεσβύτερος is common. I take the opportunity to suggest a correction to Ἐπιτηραφές Α'Νω Μακεδονίας 206, a problematic document. The editors print Διονυσίου ΠΡΕΒΑΝΤΩ | τῷ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ παιδί | τήνδε πλάκα θήκε | ἡρωίς χαίρειν. Presumably in line 1 we have Διονύσιος πρε(σβητερος) Ἀντώ[ - - ]; the obvious restoration is Ἀντω[νι], but the gender alteration τῷ παιδὶ ... ἡρωίς is troubling. I should happily read Ἀντω[νι] ... ἡρωίς τις.