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ANYRVPOI ΘΕΟΠΙΚΟΙ IN A NEW INSCRIPTION FROM HYPARPA

Right part of a marble block, said to be found “somewhere around Ödemiş”. It is now in the collection of Dr. K. Uğurbil (İzmir). Dimensions of the stone: 56 x 52 x 15; letters 2 cm high.

["Etou...", μη(νός)] Ἀπελλαίοι κύριοι
[. . . . . ..]σαυλος καὶ Ἐλπίς
[. . . . . ..]Υπαίτησαν ἡγόρασαν
[. . . . . ..]ἐπίκειμεν ἐπὶ καμάρα

5 [σχ. . . . .]η καμάρα καὶ μνημεῖον
[. . . . . .]ἐνος πρὸς τὸ εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον τεθηκε ἑαυτάς τε καὶ Τρόφιμον καὶ Ἡπειρόκρατον τους ἁγνῶς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὰ ἔγγονα αὐτῶν

10 [τῶν, μηδενός ἐξοπλισμὸς ἐξουσίαν
 [. . . . .] τηθηνενεναδε

1 We would like to thank Dr. K. Uğurbil for his permission to publish this inscription.
Line 1: The date would have been based on the Pharsalian era. The lettering points to the second century AD, and the lines 12–13 to the rule of a sole Emperor.

Line 2: Πηγόλου, Πραλλού, Αύλου are all possible. The two women who purchased the funerary complex were probably friends or relatives rather than sisters, since their respective patronyms are recorded.

Lines 4–6: These lines contain a description of the funerary complex purchased by the two ladies for their families. It consisted of at least three separate elements: 1. [………] standing on top of a kamara; 2. the kamara itself; 3. a mnemeion. Later in the text, in line 17, the whole complex is referred to as τό τέκνον τό ήρων.

Line 4: It is not absolutely clear how the three elements of the funerary complex were related to each other and how they were used by the owners. As far as the term kamara is concerned, it is common knowledge that it usually designates a (vaulted) funerary chamber constructed to receive one or more sarcophagi. Since the first preserved letter in line 4 is an iota, and one has therefore to supply the participle §pike¤menow, it follows from this that the structure mentioned at the beginning of the line stood on top of a kamara. This may not be quite what one expects, but it is not without parallels. For example, an inscription from Patara (TAM II 438) says: τό μνημεῖον κατεσκεύασεν ἐκ θεμελίων σῶν τῇ καμάρᾳ καὶ τῷ ὁ[(ν)]ογεῖιν οἴκῳ καὶ τῷ περιβόλῳ. As J. Kubińska noted “kamara est ici une chambre souterraine et sur elle, du niveau du sol, était construite la seconde partie du tombeau”. Likewise, a thorakeion or a sarcophagus can be described as being on top of a kamara. In the new text from Hypaipa some eight letters are lost before the participle επικείμενον. Basing ourselves on the available space and on the above-adduced inscription from Patara, we propose to supply τόν οἶκον επικείμενον. The term οἶκος (cella) in the funerary architecture is discussed by Kubińska (pp. 113–4). Its use can be identical

---


to that of a kamara – either to receive sarcophagi or to be used as a platform for them. Another, in our opinion less likely solution, is to supply [τὸν βομόν ἐπὶ]κείμενον and understand the term βομός as designating a platform for sarcophagi (pp. 75–8).

Line 5: Since the οἶκος/βομός and the καμάρα were built on top of each other, we propose to supply [ρέ σύν και τῇ] καμάρα. Elpis and her friend/relative had large families and needed a substantial funerary complex for their final resting places: both the oikos/bomos and the kamara below it could have contained/supported any number of sarcophagi.

Line 6: The third element of the newly-attested funerary complex from Hypaipa was a mnemeion. This general term can stand for a tomb, sarcophagus, or any funerary monument, except at Aphrodisias, where it always denotes “un piédestal, un soubassement sur lequel étaient posés des sarcophages ou au moins le sarcophage principal” (p. 18). In our case, we think it does not have a general but a more specific meaning. It seems to designate another part of the funerary complex, distinct from the oikos/bomos and the kamara. It is hard to go beyond that – we can only speculate on whether it was another funerary chamber, a specific structure like a small temenos or simply a sarcophagus. The participle ending in ἔγον probably explains its position within the complex, and since there is space for about eight letters after on, we can supply either [ον προσκεμένον] or [ον παρακεμένον].

Lines 6–7: It seems that the mnemeion mentioned in these lines as the place of burial of both families is not identical with the mnemeion featuring in lines 5–6, but with the heeron in line 17. In other words, this time the term mnemeion probably designates the whole funerary complex and not a specific part of it. There are no details as to where exactly each family was going to be interred; similar details appear in two inscriptions from Hypaipa regulating burial in tombs owned by individuals who were not blood relatives.

Lines 7–8: Unlike their wives, the husbands have neither patronymics nor ethnics. This could be a sign of their low status. In any case, they seem to be in a subordinate position: their wives have purchased the funerary complex by themselves and they explicitly forbid them to allow other burials in the complex (lines 15–17). Generally speaking, they seem to have played no part in the whole procedure. Had they been foreigners lacking the right to purchase land in Hypaipa, they would probably have recorded their ethnics in the document.

Line 11: About six letters are missing at the beginning of this line. The following word τεθηνεῦνε is clear on the photograph of the stone (ΤΕΘΝΕΝ). It looks as if the stone-cutter tried to correct his mistake and change the first Ν into an Η. We supply ἐνθηδέ. Another possibility would be to supply ἔτερου.

Line 14: Part of the fine for the violation of the tomb is to be paid to (Persian) Artemis in Hypaipa. Anahita’s sanctuary in Hypaipa, whose foundation date remains unknown (some time before Alexander),6 exhibits the same blend of Persian, Lydian and Greek cultural influences noticeable in this cult elsewhere in Asia Minor.9 Led by hereditary priests (μάγους/ἱερεῖς διὰ γένους) with an ὀρχήμανγος at their head,10 her devotees worshipped the goddess as Ἀναήτις, Ἀναήτις

---

6 Cf. TAM V 2, 1409: οὐδὲν ἐτέρου ἐξοντος ἐξουσια κατά θάδε τ(α)θῆ buz. 7 Cf. IK 23,1 (Smyrna) 199, ll. 5–7: μηδὲν ἐξοντος ἐξουσιάν ἐτέρου τεθηνεύνε. 8 According to J. Keil (RE 26, 1927, col. 2179, s. v. Lydia), the cult was established in the fifth century BC. 9 Led by hereditary priests (μάγους/ἱερεῖς διὰ γένους) with an ὀρχήμανγος at their head,10 her devotees worshipped the goddess as Ἀναήτις, Ἀναήτις

---

5 IK 17,2 (Ephesos) 3834 and 3850. 6 Cf. TAM V 2, 1409: οὐδὲν ἐτέρου ἐξοντος ἐξουσια κατά θάδε τ(α)θῆ buz. 7 Cf. IK 23,1 (Smyrna) 199, ll. 5–7: μηδὲν ἐξοντος ἐξουσιάν ἐτέρου τεθηνεύνε. 8 According to J. Keil (RE 26, 1927, col. 2179, s. v. Lydia), the cult was established in the fifth century BC. 9 S. Reinach was the first to collect all the inscriptions, coins and literary sources about Hypaipa in his article published in Rev. arch. III sér. 3, 6, 1885, 146–64. 10 IK 17,2 (Ephesos) 3817 A, 3820, 3825.
The annual (?) games called τὸ Ἀρτέμισια attracted athletes, musicians and tragic poets. The civic coinage shows the goddess standing in her temple fully attired; on her head is a high head-dress with a veil of figure-length proportions, and she maintains a stiff pose with outstretched arms. There is only one other instance of a fine payable to Artemis in Hspaipa.

Lines 15–22: This is the final clause of the document drawn up by Elpis and her friend/cousin. It regulates admittance of non-kin individuals into the funerary complex (called τὸ ἴροφον in line 17). As already noted, their husbands are forbidden to allow other burials in the tomb. The wording [μήδε]νι δὲ βουληθῶσιν συναχρήσασιν [Τρόφιμος ἢ Ἐπικράτης οἱ ἄνδρες ἡμῶν ἐπιτεθῆναι εἰς τούτο τὸ ἴροφον is unusual in its use of the aorist subjunctive in the imperative sense. One could also supply [ἐν]τέθήσασιν.

Lines 17–19: These lines bring perhaps the most interesting novelty. They contain the clause giving the right of burial in the funerary complex to a non-kin group referred to as ἄνθρωποι θρηστηκόι. The wording is very confused and not easily understood: ἔξουσαν ἔξουσιν ἔτι τεκέων τρέφοντες [ἐν]τοῖς ἄνθρωποις θρηστηκόις ἐν ίν’ [ἐλευ]θερόσει τις αὐτῶν. Following closely on the prohibitive clause relating to the owners’ husbands, almost as an afterthought, one last group is given the right to be interred in the family tomb. In this elliptic phrase the infinitive συναχρήσασι should be understood as depending on the phrase ἔξουσαν ἔξουσιν, but who the subject of the clause is remains unclear—probably the wives and the husbands together. We venture to translate “they (sc. the owners/the wives/the husbands) will have the right (to allow burial) to the nurturers of (our) children [among] ἄνθρωποι θρηστηκόι if one of them is set free by them (sc. the owners/the wives/the hubands)”.

One result emerges from all this beyond all doubt, namely, that the future freedmen of the house presently entrusted with the nurturing of their masters’ children will have a right to be interred in the heroon. These nurturers are designated as τεκέων τρέφοντες (τεκέων τρέφοντες in the dative case depending on the infinitive συναχρήσασι). For unknown reasons (unless we take this to be another stone-cutter’s mistake) Elpis and her friend preferred the poetic form τεκέων to the common τεκνόν. For their children’s upbringers they likewise use the present participle τρέφοντες that had evolved into a noun, instead of the past participle γεγενενεῖτε usually found in inscriptions. We can explain this by the fact that the process of nurturing was an on-going one, while in most of the cases recorded in inscriptions the relationship nurtured/nurturer was terminated by the death of one of the parties involved or by the child reaching maturity.

The large group of about 260 inscriptions from the Greek world commemorating foster-parents and nurturers (οἱ θρήναντες) can be divided into two groups. The first is made up of free and

11 The exact find-spot of the inscription featuring Persian Artemis [IK 17,2 (Ephesos) 3840 A = SEG 31, 998] is not known.


13 IK 17,2 (Ephesos) 3840 A = SEG 31, 998.
slave up-bringers whose relationship with their nurslings is that of masters,14 patrons,15 foster-parents16 and possibly adoptive parents.17 The other group consists of nurses and educators, mostly of servile18 or libertine19 status, rarely free(born) and not related to the family of the nursling.20 As far as the second group is concerned, our impressions of Greek nurses (both male and female) as mostly family slaves or ex-slaves of their nurslings’ families, is supported by researches on nurses in Rome.21 Their use points to an exploitative element in the life of the nurse occasioned by the birth of her own child or children.22 We know of only three cases of nurslings of recognizably servile background entrusted to the care of a nurse and/or nurturer,23 but there could be more examples difficult to identify. For instance, in north-east Lydia we find several inscriptions mentioning seven, eight, or in one case even thirty-four people reared by the same couple or individual.24 A couple who nurtured eight òρεπτωι were slaves of one Antistius Priscus.25 Is it reasonable to assume that a native or a slave family in this part of the Roman Empire could own seven, eight, let alone thirty-four slaves? Perhaps, but we would like to suggest the possibility seems supported by the appearance of two Phrygian male tutors styled ὃπας;27 the

14 E.g.: FD III 6, nos. 15, 43, 124; C. Dunant, BCH 75, 1951, 311–2 no. 3 = SEG 12, 255; Ph. M. Petas – M. B. Hatzopoulos – L. Gounaropoulou – P. Paschidis, Inscriptions du sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux Autochtones de Leukopétra (Macédoine) [Μελέτηματα 28], Athens 2000, nos. 19, 81, 95.
16 IG II/II 3,1, 3969; IK 31 (Klaudiopolis) 160 (natural father is also the foster-father).
17 IK 18 (Kyzikos und Umgebung) 160; MAMA IX 270.
18 E.g.: IG V 1, 608; N. Müller, MDAH(R) 1886, 52 s. = J.-P. Frey, CII vol. 1, Roma 1936, App. 3, 17: τοῦ δὲ ὀρέπτων ἡ κόρη; G. Petzl, EA 15, 1990, 60 no. 17 = SEG 40, 1067; IK 18 (Kyzikos und Umgebung) 207; TAM IV 1, 134: the nutritor perished together with his two nurslings in an earthquake; IK 31 (Klaudiopolis) 103; MAMA VII 60; MAMA IX 98; IK 17,1 (Ephesos) 3084–5.
20 E.g.: C. B. Kritzas, Κριτζας Χρυσικά 30, 1990, 10 no. 3 = SEG 41, 732; IK 40,1 (Prusa ad Olympum) 1056.
22 Cf. K. R. Bradley, Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire. A Study in Social Control (Collection Latomus vol. 185), Bruxelles 1984, 72–3; Joshel, op. cit. 5–6.
25 TAM V 1, 782.
26 In Dig. 32.1.99 we find a mention of a slave born in the city and sent to the countryside to be reared there (eum, qui natus est ex ancilla urbana et missus in uillam nutritendi). Cf. S. Dixon, AULLA XXII (Papers and Synopses from the 22nd Congress of the Australasian Universities’ Language and Literature Association), Canberra 1984, 16; ead., The Roman Family, Baltimore/London 1992, 128; K. R. Bradley, Historical Reflections/Reflexions historiques 12, 1985, 491–4; 512–4; id., in B. Rawson (ed.), op. cit. 207–11.
27 MAMA VII 170; MAMA VIII 357.
word is synonymous with τροφεύς ("breeder, nurturer, tutor"), and the wording of both texts suggests that it is a professional description of one who is responsible for young children in a household, and a social term of relation. In cases of slaves nurtured away from their master’s house, the use of a wet-nurse and childminders was simply one part of the slave-breeding process. Inscriptions give evidence only of affectionate relationship – if nurses and educators had a disciplinary role to play, this has not left any traces in the epitaphs.

To come back to the new inscription – the phrase ἕνθρωποι θερεπτικοῖ in line 19 seems to be a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. In our opinion, it is equivalent to θερεπτικοῖ, τροφεῖς, nutritores, in other words, nurses, breeders, educators and tutors of children, both male and female. Although the adjective θερεπτικός is not elsewhere attested in this sense, it is perfectly understandable: the ἕνθρωποι θερεπτικοί in question were slaves of the tomb’s owners employed as tutors of children, probably not only their masters’ children but also their house-born or bought slaves. Thanks to their close relations with Elpis and the rest of the family, the ones who nurtured their masters’ children could expect an early manumission and the privilege of being buried in the family tomb. If the two families who purchased the funerary complex owned slaves who were, we could almost say, professionally trained nurses, it follows that they were reasonably well-off and also that they could have profitably employed their ἕνθρωποι θερεπτικοί for nursing other people’s children and slaves. Cases of slave-women hired by their masters to nurse other people’s children and slaves are occasionally found in papyri. One of us is currently studying the whole issue of θερεπτοί and related categories in the Greek world and Lydia and Phrygia in particular.

Lines 20–22 complete the preceding clause by adding that the manumitted ἕνθρωπος θερεπτικός will be allowed to bury his children in the same tomb.

Finally, we give the complete reading and translation of this new interesting inscription from Hypaipa:

["Ετους ... , μη(νός)] Ἀπελλάιου κ’
[. . . . . . . . . .] συλου καὶ Ἐλπίς
[. . . . . . . . .] Ὑπα[. . . . .].ιπνα[. . . . .].ιγόρα[. . . . .].αν
[τόν οίκον ἐπικείμενον ἐπὶ καμάρα-]
5 [ρὰ σὺν καὶ τῇ καμάρᾳ καὶ μνημεῖ·]

28 The Latin equivalent is tata (S. Dixon, The Roman Mother, London/Sydney 1988, 146–9; H. Sigismund Nielsen, Classica et Mediaevalia 40, 1989, 191–6). In CIL VI 21279a we meet a freedman who had been a nutritor both of his patrona’s children and her alumni.

29 We are aware of only one inscription from Ephesus [IK 16, 2223 a 1 (sarcophagus; reign of Marcus and Verus or Marcus and Commodus)]: on the sarcophagus, erased: [ ... ] [τὸν Πετρούσαν] τοῦ κυρίου ἑγγορασαν...

30 Cf. CPapGr I 4, 10, 12, 32, 33, 35, 37, 39.

31 One study, “Legal and Social Status of θερεπτοί and Related Categories in the Greek World: The Case of Phrygia in the Roman Period” has recently been published in a collection of studies entitled Νεοελληνική κληρονομιά στοιχεία Σύμβουλ τ. Α’, Belgrade 2005, 145–166, and two other ones (“Legal and Social Status of θερεπτοί in Narrative and Documentary Sources” presented at the 2003 conference organised by the Institute for Advanced Studies in Jerusalem, and “Legal and Social Status of θερεπτοί and Related Categories in the Greek World: The Case of Lydia in the Roman Period”) are currently in print.
“In the year ..., on the 20th day of the month of Apellaios: [ (daughter of) ]aulos and Elpis [(daughter of) ] , citizens of Hypaipa, purchased [an oikos/bomos lying on] top of a kamara, together with the kamara, and a mnemeion on lying nearby, so that the two of them [are buried] in the mnemeion and Tropimos and Epikrates their husbands [and their] children and grandchildren, no one (else) having the right to be buried [here]: if anyone [does anything] contrary to this, he will pay into the lord Caesar’s fiscus 2,500 denarii and to the Artemis in Hypaipa 1,500. Let our husbands Tropimos and Epikrates allow no one else to be buried in this heroon [after us]; they (sc. the owners/the wives/the husbands) will have the right (to allow burial) to the nurturers of (our) children [among] ἀνθρώποι θρεπτικοὶ, if one of them is set free by them (sc. the owners/the wives/the husbands); likewise, the manumitted one (will have) the right for his children to be buried here.”

Özet

Makalede, Ödemiş civarında bulunduğu söylenen ve şimdi Dr. K. Uğurbil (İzmir) Koleksiyonu’nda korunmakta olan bir mezar yazısı incelenmektedir. İ.S. 2. yüzyıla tarihlenmesi mümkün olan bu yazıtta, arkadaş ya da akabra olan iki kadının (Hypaipa’da?) satın aldığı ve kocaların yanındaki mekanla (mnemeion) ile birlikte satın alınmıştı. Yazarın en ilginç kısmı, anthropoi threptikoı olarak adlandırılan ve mezar sahipleri ile herhangi bir kan bağları bulunmayan bir gruptan söz edilmesidir. Belli ki bunlar, bu ailenin çocukları eğiten ve köle statüsünde bulunan kimseledir.

kocalarımız bu mezara bir başkasının gömülmesine izin vermeyeceklerdir. Mezar sahipleri, kendi çocuklarına bakan beslemelerden (anthropoi threptikoi) herhangi birini azat ettiği takdirde, bu azatlıya ve onun çocuklarına buraya gömülme izni verilecektir”.
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