

PETER J. THONEMANN

NOTES ON INSCRIPTIONS FROM KONYA

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 36 (2003) 87–94

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## 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*.<sup>1</sup> Here I offer textual suggestions on some of the more notable documents.

8.

Ζιοκωμητῶν δήμος κατὰ [ - - - ]  
πρὸς θεῶν Ζιζιμηνηῆς ἐπ' ἰε[ρέως - - - ]  
εντος, ἐπιμελητῶν Παδου Εὐμενεδήμου, [ - - - ]  
δημος Πάπα, Ἐγνάτιος Διομήδους, ΠΑΣΔ [ - - - ]

In ll. 1–2, read [Μη]τρὸς 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, ΕΠΙΕ is an error of transcription: the spacing and letter traces require ΕΠΙ . Ε[ - - . The missing letter could be a *sigma*; *iota* is excluded. Presumably an eponymous magistrate; ἐπὶ σ[τε]φανηφόρου is not impossible, although the *sigma* and *tau* would be squeezed very close together. In line 3, Εὐμενεδήμου is an error of transcription: read Παδου 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.

Ἀππα[ς]  
Εἴρου Δ[τὴ Μ-]  
εἰσίτω εὐ[χὴν]  
[ - - - - - - - ]

The metronymic is very unlikely and Εἴρου is not the genitive of Εἶρις. Read Ἀππα[ς Μ]εἴρου: the name is attested several times at Iconium. The line division Μεἴρου is unproblematic with Μεἰσίτω following.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 **203** ('unpublished'), see G. Laminger-Pascher, *Beiträge zu den griechischen Inschriften Lykaoniens* (Wien, 1984), no. 153.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  
 ΚΑΓ Δικαίω  
 (εὐ)χήν.

Mysterious inscription. Another recent attempt at interpretation by Cl. Brixhe, ‘Prolegomènes au corpus Neo-Phrygien’, *BSL* 94 (1999) 285–315, at 291–2, who reads Της (personal name) πάρθεικαι (= παρέθηκε) Δικαίω | (ἐ)χήν (‘simple oubli du graveur ou forme phonétique?’).

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| I<br>[ὁ δεῖνα -]<br>(e.g.) νίου Ὀσίω<br>εὐ- | II<br>[name ending in] -της Παρθε-<br>καὶ Δικαίω<br>-χήν |
|---|--|

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

51.

Λ. Α[ἴ]λιος Πρ[ί]σ-  
 κος Πατρο[κλ-]  
 οῦς υἰὸς  
 κ(αὶ) Αἰλία  
 5 ἀτῶ γυν[ή]  
 ἐαυτοῖς 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. Αἴλιος Πρ[εῖσ]κος Πατρο[κλ]οῦς υἰὸς καὶ Λου]κία Αἰλία . [c. 4–5]αῖω γυνῆ [αὐτοῦ] ἐαυτοῖς κτλ. Ailia’s name is of the form Δικαίω, Ἐρμαίω *vel sim.*

56.

Lines 9–11:

... κήδει ἐπ’ ἀλγινόεντι δάμης δμ-  
 ηθεῖσα(ν) προμοίρωσ, ἰ ὄ φθόν· ἐνείκησας  
 με καὶ ἦνε πόθου ἐμάρανες·

Erroneous word-division. Read δάμης δμηθεῖσα προμοίρως· ὦ φθόν', ἐνείκησάς | με καὶ ἦν ἐποθοῦ ἐμάρανες. For the theme of the epitaph, see e.g. Peek, *Gr. Vers-Inschr.* I 1732 = Merkelbach–Stauber, *Steinepigramme* III 14/13/05 (Isaura Nova).

## 74.

Ll. 1–3, Ὀνομά[σ]τη Ἐρμῆ | νίω κτλ. In line 2 the stone clearly reads ΕΡΠΗ, with space for a further letter at line end. The son's name is Ερπη[α]; the name Ερπιας 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 ἔλξει Μῆνα κ[α]ταχθόνι[ον] κεχολωμένον], 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:

ἔαν (sic) ΠΟΤΟΥ  
 τω ΤΑΜΟ  
 κακον ΤΥΗ  
 ΣΕΙΣ . . ΕΙΜΗΝ  
 5 κατὰ . ΘΩΝΙ  
 ΟΝΚΕ . ΩΛΩ  
 μενον

Read presumably ἔαν τις τού[τω] | τῷ τάπω | κακὸν πύησει, ἔ[ξ]ει Μῆν[α] κατα[χ]θόνιον κε[χ]λωμένον.

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

Ἐρμαῖς Ἀπολλω-  
 νίου καὶ Τατας ΠΡ  
 ΟΦΑ Ω  
 του ἐποιήσ-  
 5 αν κτλ.

The photograph scarcely supports the reading Ἐρμαῖς in l. 1: read, no doubt, [Αὐ]ρήλις: 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. Ἀνένκλητος | Οὐενούστου | κέ Αὐρ. Δόμνα | Αὐρ. Ματίη | θυγατρὶ μνήμης | χάριν.

99.

Ουρ(δ)ιος ἀνέστησεν Γου(ν)δει[α-]  
 [v]ἔν γυνέκα αὐτοῦ, Μα[.]  
 [.] (ν) ἀδελφός(ν), (κ)ῆ Ουρδίουα(ν)

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>(Left)</i> | <i>Centre</i> | <i>Right)</i> |
| ΣΕ            | ΝΓΟΥΔ         | ΕΙ            |

‘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]ούβλιος ἀνέστησεν Γουδει[α]-  
 [v]ἔν γυνέκα αὐτοῦ· Μα[.]  
 [.]ς ἀδελφός Πουβλίου ἀ[νέσ]-  
 [τη]σεν Γουδει-  
 [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                                       |
|    | αὐ-   |
|    | [τοῦ]                                       |
| 10 | [.] ΠΙΝΗΣΜΩΝΑΧΗΣ καὶ Α[- ca.3 -]ης τοῦ Θεοῦ |
|    | [- ca.3 -] ΕΗΑΝΑΓΗΝΟΣΚΩΝΤΕΣ εὐχ[ήν].        |

The inscription is Christian. In lines 3–4, read [.]ΚΕ | [.]ΤΙΣ: I have no restoration to suggest. [.]ρινης preserves the end of the girl’s name. She was a μωναχῆς καὶ δ[ού]λης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ‘nun and slave of God’. In what follows, ΑΝΑΓΗΝΟΣΚΩΝΤΕΣ presumably derives from ἀναγι(γ)νώσκω, ‘you who read this’. εὐχ[ήν] is senseless. One would willingly restore εὐχ[εσθε *vel sim.*: L. Robert, *Hellenica* I (Limoges, 1940), 33–36.

124.

M. offers text and translation as follows.

- μνήμ' ἀλόχῳ·  
 Φιλίη Ἀγάθις [ἔ-]  
 τευξεν | κὲ ὈΜΟ[.]  
 ΑΤΝΗ ν. καὶ θυγάτη[ρ]  
 5 Μαξιμήνη, ΜΗΣ[.]  
 [.]ΗΝΟΥΝ[ca. 1-2]ΚΑΠΙΑ[.]  
 ΤΑΝΕ[.]ΧΕΝΟΜΟ[.]σ-  
 [ωφ]ροσύνη ἀρε-  
 τῆς τὴν ἔξοχα-  
 10 [ν] πασῶν.

‘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:

- μνήμ' ἀλόχῳ  
 φιλίη Ἀγαθίς  
 τευξεν κὲ ὀμο[φ]-  
 άτνη | καὶ θυγάτ[ηρ]  
 5 Μαξιμή, <μ>νήμης χ[ά]-  
 [ρ]ιν, οὖν[ε]κα π[ά]σ[σ]-  
 αν | ἔ[σ]χεν ὀμο-  
 [φ]ροσύνην ἀρε-  
 τῆς τὴν ἔξοχα  
 πασῶν.

Evidently Ἀγαθίς m., not Ἀγαθίς f. No parallel presents itself for ὀμοφάτνη, 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 θυγατ[ρὶ] Μαξιμή is possible, which would give additional point to ὀμοφροσύνη; but the singular verb ἔσχεν in l. 7 militates against this.

127.

- Μέμν-  
 ον Ἰούστ-  
 η γλυκυ-  
 τάτη μοῦ  
 5 γυνειχὶ Δό-  
 ξα ἀνέστη-  
 σαι στύλη-  
 ν, μνήμη-  
 ς χάριν.

‘Memnon, erected (this) stele for Iusta Doxa, his (lit. my) beloved wife, in memory.’

Some errors of transcription and word-division. Read Μεμνόνιος τῆ γλυκυτάτη μου | γυνεχὶ Δόλιζα ἀνέστησα ἰστήλην μνήμηις χάριν. Confusion between 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person is also (erroneously) posited by Jonnes at *I. Sultan Daği* 32, where read presumably Παπύλος Στεφάνου ἐατῶ ζῶν | ἀνέστησεν.

144.

Μνησίθεος κὲ Τειμόθεος ἀτῶ  
τ(ῶ) Καλλιμάχῳ ἀδελφῶ  
[ ca. 7–8 ] μνήμηις χάριν

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

145.

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

181.

Sarcophagus of Αἴλιος Ζωεῖλος NEO[ . ] | ΓΑΥΣΑΠΑΡΙΣ and his wife. M. tentatively suggests that the sequence of letters may conceal an ethnic. I would prefer to see Zoilos νεό[ς] as a γαυσαπάριος, a maker of *gausape*, woollen frieze (*TLL* VI (2) 1720-21); for the great flocks of Lycaonia, see Strabo xii 6.1: ἡ χώρα πρόβια ἐκτρέφει θαυμαστῶς, τραχείας δὲ ἐρέας, καὶ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν τούτων μεγίστους πλούτους ἐκτήσαντο· Ἀμύντας δ’ ὑπὲρ τριακοσίας ἔσχε ποιμένας ἐν τοῖς τόποις τούτοις. See in general G. Labarre & M.-Th. Le Dinaret, *Les métiers du textile en Asie Mineure de l’époque hellénistique à l’époque impériale*, in *Aspects de l’Artisanat du Textile dans la Monde Méditerranéen* (Lyon, 1996), 49–116 (for Caria, add now *BE* (1998) 385, Orthosia).

193.

Δας Μενεκράτη ἀνδρὶ  
μνήμα· κατάραις ὑποκ-  
[εῖ]σ(εται) θ(ε)ῶ Δι(ι) ὃς ἄν τις βλάψη  
τάφον.

Unnecessary complication and bad grammar. Read κατάραις ὑποκίσθω Διός, ἄν τις βλάψη τάφον. Compare **157**.13–14, where read ὑποκίσθ[ω] | τ(ῶ) φισκῶ.



208.

A line omitted from the transcription. Lines 5ff. should read τῆ γλυκυτάτη κὲ πολυποθι-  
νοτάτη συνβίῳ Θέικλης κὲ ἑμαυτῶ. The irrational genitive is very common, e.g. 160.6–7, τῆ  
συνβίῳ αὐτοῦ Ζόης; *MAMA* I 383, τῆ συνβίῳ μου Θέικλης; *I. Sultan Daği* 319, τῆ ἰδίᾳ  
θυγατρὶ Οὐαλεντίλλης; *I. Sultan Daği* 327, τῆ μητρὶ Πριευτος. This last example permits  
us to correct a personal name at 69.7–8; for Πρειουι | τ(ῆ) θυγατρί, read Πρειουιτι θυγατρί.

219.

Lines 9–12 lay down penalties against desecrators of the tomb.

ὄς δὲ ἂν ἐπισβιασέτη ΗΠΟΣΟΙΣ  
10 χήρα τὴν βαρύφθονον·  
δώσι θεῶ λόγον·  
τὸν θεόν σοι μὴ ἀδικήση.

‘... 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 ἐπεισβιάσεται, fut. indic.: thus also βούλομη in l. 6. The  
photograph of the squeeze at fig. 261 suggests the reading ΧΙΕΡΑ at the start of l. 10, i.e.  
χῆρα with *epsilon* and *iota* reversed. Read here ὄς δὲ ἂν ἐπισβιάσεται ἢ ποσοίσι[ι] χ(εἰ)ρα  
τὴν βαρύφθονον. The formula is extremely common: see J. Strubbe, *ΑΠΑΙ ΕΠΙΤΥΜΒΙΟΙ*  
(Bonn, 1997) (*IGSK* 52), App. 2.1, pp. 285–288; many exx. have the spelling ποσοίσι(ε)ι. The  
formula in l. 12 (which M. mistranslates) has frequently been discussed: A. Wilhelm, *Griechi-  
sche 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 ἀδικήση[ς]: on the grammatical confusion, see Gibson, 63.

220.

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

221.

Α[π]πας τῶ Πασίων[ι]  
ἐπέθηκεν ἐ[στή]λην v. Θία  
πενθερῶ αὐτ{τ}οῦ.\*

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 -στο[ς] or -ετο[ς].  
Presumably a patronymic follows, Πασίων[ος], providing more plausible syntax.

222.

Christian epitaph. Lines 6–12 are printed by M. thus:

ἐνορχίζω ὑμᾶς  
 τὸν κληῖρον τὸν νῦ[v]  
 κὲ τὸν [ΤΟΥ] ἐπερκόμε-  
 νον κὲ πάντας τοὺς  
 10 ἐν τῷ γένῳ μου ΠΡΑΚΕ-  
 ΥΝ κὲ ΑΓΙΠΙΝΑ τὸν τά-  
 πον κοσμήσατε.

Mysterious oath formula. Read π(ατέ)ρα κὲ | υ(ιὸ)ν κὲ ἄγι(ον) πν(εῦ)μα. Perusal of the photograph at fig. 264 confirms that ΠΡΑ, ΥΝ, and ΠΙΝΑ all carry abbreviation marks. A close parallel at Soloi in Cyprus, ὁ(ρ)κείζομεν ὑμᾶς τὸν Θεὸν τὸν π(α)ντοκράτορα κὲ Πατέρα κὲ Υεῖον κὲ τὸ ἄγειον 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, εἴσχησε | πρὸς πατέραν καὶ υεῖον κὲ ἄγιον πνεῦμα. Tangentially, the name of the ἐπεῖσκοπος in ll. 6-7 of the Philomelian inscription (Ἐπιγύρειον) is very implausible: the photo is unhelpful, but seems to permit the reading Γρηγόρειον.

223.

[-----]  
 Α[... ]ΡΕΤΟΣ  
 ἀν[έστη]σα τῷ  
 ΠΑ[... ]ΛΟΥΕΥΡ  
 5 ΕΤ[. . π]ρε(σ)β(υτέρῳ) κτλ.

Although not unparalleled with personal names, the definite article frequently precedes specification of family relationship. Hence read ἀν[έστη]σα τῷ | πα[τρὶ] Λου(κίῳ) Εὐριέτ[ῳ] π[ρε(σ)β(υτέρῳ)]. Presumably the son's name was also [Εὐ]ρετος. For the name, see A. Wilhelm, *Akademischeschriften* 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 *Ἐπιγραφές Ἰων Μακεδονίας* 206, a problematic document. The editors print Διονύσιος ΠΡΕΒΑΝΤΩ | τῷ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ παιδὶ | τήνδε πλάκα θῆκε· | ἡρώϊς χαίρειν. Presumably in line 1 we have Διονύσιος πρε(σ)β(ύτερος) Ἄντω[- -]; the obvious restoration is Ἄντω[νία], but the gender alteration τῷ παιδὶ ... ἡρώϊς is troubling. I should happily read Ἄντω[νίῳ] ... ἡρωίς.

227 &amp; 228.

Surprising collocation. A single inscription, text - -]ω τεύξαντα σὸν θυηπόλ[ον - -.