

STANLEY E. PORTER

ARTEMIS MEDEIA INSCRIPTION AGAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 93 (1992) 219–221

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## Artemis Medeia Inscription Again<sup>1</sup>

First-hand observation of the 3rd century B.C. funerary stele of Poseides son of Herakleides (Getty accession number 79AA145) warrants further remarks upon the transcription and notes made by Al. N. Oikonomides (*ZPE* 45 [1982] 115-18 with pl. IV [*SEG* XXXII 1612]).

### I. Description of the Stele

As Oikonomides rightly notes, this stone appears to be a fairly early example of a funerary imprecatory stele from Asia Minor, invoking the goddess Artemis Medeia and Ephesian Artemis. The Medeian Artemis is probably Persian Anahita, as S. M. Sherwin-White has recognized (*ZPE* 44 [1982] 30). Thanks to the native cult of Anahita, the Artemis cult became widespread in Asia minor. The abundant inscriptional evidence shows that Anahita was renamed with various forms of Meter or especially Artemis throughout Asia Minor. For example she is called Περσική [θεά] (*TAM* V 2.1396; "*regio a Magnesia ad septentrionres vergens*") or Ἄρτεμις Περσική (*TAM* V 2.1244 and 1245; Hierocaesarea) among other things, and even Μήτηρ Ἀναίτις Ἀξιοττηνή (*TAM* V 1.325; Göldel). Similar evidence is to be found at Hypaipa and Philadelphia, where the cult had manifest similarities with the cult of Ephesian Artemis. On the basis of these similarities, the Getty inscription may well originate from the area of one of the centers of Artemis worship, possibly the region of Hierocaesaria, Hypaipa and Philadelphia.<sup>2</sup>

The stele is adorned with a flame-like finial impressive for its precise and intricate carving. The inscription begins just under the base of the finial and descends to just above the shorter of two relief figures. The figures appear to have been carved on the stone before the inscription, because of the orientation of the text on either side of the taller figure. The two relief figures are a man, presumably Poseides himself, and a smaller female figure, who comes up to just above Poseides's bent left elbow.<sup>3</sup> The female figure, positioned as if she is following Poseides from right to left across the stone, butts up against the edge of the stele and is carved for the most part in profile, showing her hair pulled back. Poseides is slightly off-center to the left as one looks at the stone, with his body turned slightly to his left and his face full-on. The two figures have similar clothing, including a chiton and an himation, with similar draping over their left arms. The male figure, however, has a deep carved line descending from his right shoulder. Although this is probably made into a fold of the outer

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Ms. Karol Wight, curatorial assistant, for arranging my examination of this inscription in the beautiful surroundings of the J. Paul Getty Museum; Jeff Reed and John Reed for help with the actual transcription; and Professors R. Merkelbach and L. Koenen for their many useful suggestions regarding its publication.

<sup>2</sup> For the Lydian cult of Anahita see M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* II (Munich<sup>2</sup> 1961) 672-73; G. Petzl, "Eine Weihung an die MHTHP ANATIΔOC," *ZPE* 20 (1976) 223-24.

<sup>3</sup> Oikonomides speculates whether this is a daughter or whether this is his wife, with Poseides depicted with heroic stature.

garment (corresponding to a similar fold of the female's garment), the fact that it simply fades into the stone may reveal that it was a mistake made when carving Poseides's right arm. The female figure has characteristics typical of hellenistic carving of clothing, with the unnatural heaviness of the garment draped over the left arm and its bunching at the left shoulder suggesting what could almost be a third garment.

Two other significant features of the stele warrant mention as well. First, the stele still has discernable remnants of at least the figures and the finial having been painted. The object which the female figure holds in her hand (Oikonomides speculates that it could be an offering) appears to be round and quite red. Among other items still evidencing paint are the bottom ridge of the finial, with a toothed pattern apparently in red, the underside of the himation of the male figure in a darkish red, the hair of the figures apparently in black, the surface of the garments of both figures in a very light apparently reddish color, as well as various other crevices.

Second, the most noticeable coloring on the stone is reserved for the figure of a dog. The painted dog—now quite faint but still clearly observable—is walking along with the male figure. His head is looking up apparently at his master's finger. I would contend that the male figure is pointing with his right hand toward the upturned head of the dog rather than to the ground or earth, as Oikonomides contends. The dog is depicted as standing to the right of its master, about knee-high (thus the dog is seen to be behind the legs of the male figure). The dog's tale curls up, between the male and the female figures. The state of preservation of the stone—both with regard to its engraving and the quality of the relief and its painting—makes for a quite impressive artifact.

## II. Text of the Inscription

This text is an early example of a protective funerary monument which may have been located proximate to a family burial plot, as Oikonomides correctly observes. The marble is a light greyish brown, and measures .535 x 1.65 meters, at a thickness of .18 meters.

The text as found on the stone is transcribed as follows, with a space in the middle used to indicate where the larger of the two figures stands. It is clear that I find Oikonomides's interpretation very plausible at most points.

	Τοῦτο τὸ μνήμα Ποσειδίου Ἡρακλείδου δικαίου	
	ἄνθρωπου· οὐδένα δὲ ἠδίκησε πώποτε. εἰ δέ	
	τις θέλει θεωρῆσαι καὶ ἀγαθὸν εἰπεῖν, τούτῳ οἱ θε-	
4	οὶ ἴλεως εἶχαν· ἀδικῆσαι δὲ μηθέν. εἴ τις δὲ ἀδ-	
	ικήσει τοῦτο τὸ μνήμα ἢ τὰ φυτὰ ταῦτα ἢ τὰ ζ-	
	ῶια ἢ ἕτερον νεκρὸν εἰσενέγκοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μνή-	
	μα πλὴν ἐμοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τῶν	
8	ἐμῶν υἱῶν	καὶ θυγατέρων ἐαυτοῦ {c}, εἴ τι-
	c δὲ ἢ ἐπ' ἐν-	εχύροις λήσεται τὸ μνήμ-
	α τοῦτο ἢ ὡ-	νήσεται ἢ αὐτὸς ἢ ἕτεροις π-
	[ρ]οστάξει ἢ	ἕτερον νεκρὸν εἰσενέγκοι π-
12	λὴν οὐκ αὐτὸ-	c προεἴλετο τούτῳ τῷ μν-

	ήματι, εἴ τις ἦ ει τούτωι, ἦ ᾽Α- ὶ ἦ Ἐφεσία	ὑβριν ἢ ἀνάγκην ποιή- ρτεμις ἢ Μήδεια κα- καὶ οἱ θεοὶ ἅπαντες
16	αὐτὸν κ-	αἰ τοὺς ἐγγόνους.

The following readings differ from or supplement those of Oikonomides:

1 ΗΡΑΚΑΚΙΔΟΥ: Oikonomides rightly corrects this reading to Ἡρακλείδου (printed above), however without indicating the reading of the stone. The C and the I, though unusually close together, are distinct, as is the A.

2 οὐδένα δὲ ἠδίκησε: Oikonomides inadvertently omits the δέ.

3, 4-5, 6, 9, 10, 10-11, 11, 13-14: indicative, future, optative, and subjunctive verbs are freely used after εἰ, as is permissible at the time. Whereas the syntactical pattern became quite frequent in papyri since the first century, it appears to have occurred more frequently much earlier in inscriptions.<sup>4</sup>

4-5 ἀδικήκη: Oikonomides erroneously writes ἀδικήκη.

5-6 ζῖωια: Oikonomides reads δῶια, but corrects it to ζῶια, with reference to "the figures, the images, the art decoration of the tomb(s) in the family burial plot belonging to Poseides." The stone indeed has ζῖωια. At the end of line 5, the stone is broken along the vertical line of the last letter, but enough of it and the top horizontal line, as well as the entire bottom horizontal line, is left to read *zeta* (Ζ).

8 ἐαυτοῦ{c}: This is an instance of the third person reflexive pronoun being used for the first person, as Oikonomides rightly notes. But the genitive singular is needed, suggesting that ἐαυτοῦ should be read instead (= ἐμαυτοῦ, ἐμοῦ).<sup>5</sup>

8-9 τις δὲ ἦ ἐπ': Oikonomides erroneously writes δη.

10-11 π[ρ]οτάξιη: so Oikonomides. In comparison to the other lines the *omikron* is slightly indented. It is preceded by a rather large gouge out of the stone but there may not be enough space for the letter *rho*. There is the remote possibility that the gouge in the stone already was present when the text was engraved. If so, the stone mason may have inadvertently omitted the *rho*.

16 ἐγγόνους: Oikonomides calls this "a popular corruption for ἐκόνους." This is, of course, a common assimilation.<sup>6</sup>

University of Sheffield, England

Stanley E. Porter

<sup>4</sup> See F. Blass, A. Debrunner, F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen<sup>15</sup> 1979) par. 372.4 with note 11.

<sup>5</sup> On use of the third person reflexive pronoun for the first person see E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* II 2 (Berlin-Leipzig 1934) 69.21, 72.23-26; cf. 70.19 on position.

<sup>6</sup> See W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (Leipzig 1903) 54-55; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* I 1<sup>2</sup> (Berlin-Leipzig 1934) 201f.; F. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* I (Milan 1977) 167; L. Threutte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* I (Berlin-New York 1980) 581.