

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXVI

HELSINKI 2002

INDEX

EUGENIO AMATO	<i>Note esegetiche e testuali alla Descriptio orbis di Dionisio d'Alessandria (I)</i>	7
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Minimum Corinthium</i>	19
UTA-MARIA LIERTZ	<i>Kybele bei den Matronae Vacallinehae? Eine Fallstudie aus der Germania Inferior</i>	31
MARIA NIKU	<i>Aspects of the Taxation of Foreign Residents in Hellenistic Athens</i>	41
MASSIMO PIERPAOLI	<i>P. Volumnius Eutrapelus</i>	59
ARI SAASTAMOINEN	<i>On the Problem of Recognising African Building Inscriptions</i>	79
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>On the Origin of Die Inschriften von Prusa ad Olymum No. 52</i>	97
WERNER J. SCHNEIDER	<i>Laetinus' Fieberkurve. Zur Textüberlieferung von Martial 12, 17, 9/10</i>	103
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CIC–CCVI</i>	107
HOLGER THESLEFF	<i>Intertextual Relations between Xenophon and Plato?</i>	143
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	159
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	216
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	218
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	221

**ON THE ORIGIN OF
*DIE INSCRIFTEN VON PRUSA AD OLYMPUM NO. 52***

OLLI SALOMIES

The edition of the inscriptions from (or in some cases in) Prusa in Bithynia (now Bursa) by Th. Corsten, *Die Inschriften von Prusa ad Olympum*, consists of two volumes, *Teil I*, devoted to inscriptions "die mit ausreichender Sicherheit der antiken Stadt Prusa zugewiesen werden können" (p. ix), and of *Teil II* containing inscriptions of in some cases uncertain origin now in Bursa. In the first volume, no. 52 is an inscription which is introduced as a "Namenliste eines Kultvereins". The stone (illustrated in the edition by four photographs) is described as a "Platte aus Marmor" (the measurements are given as 39×105×18 cm). Only the central part of the original stone is left, the stone being fragmentary left and right and in the lower part, and the upper part having been sawn off, possibly at the moment when the stone was built into the steps of a mosque in Bursa, from where it has since been moved to the museum.

The inscription consists of three columns of which those on the left and on the right are fragmentary, although most of the latter column has been preserved. As for the *ipsa verba* of the inscription, what one finds here are names, most of them of the Roman type (the presence of Aelii and the absence of Aurelii, whether abbreviated or written in full, provides an approximate date), the names only once being interrupted by the term *μύσται* in col. b, line 8. Some of the names are followed by abbreviated titles of the type *βασι.*, *μυσταρ.*

As far as I can see, the origin of this inscription from Prusa has not been questioned.¹ However, even those with only a slight knowledge of

¹ This inscription is mentioned at least by P. Herrmann, *EA* 20 (1992) 72, and by Cl. Brixhe and A. Panayotou in *Bull. épigr.* 1994, 570, but these scholars do not disagree with the alleged origin from Prusa. In what seems to be the only review of the volume, that by G. Thür in *ZRG* 113 (1996) 476–8, this inscription is not touched upon.

Cyzicene epigraphical habits must recognize at once that this is another inscription from Cyzicus. That this is the case is in fact so obvious that this does not seem to be in need of demonstration. However, as this can be done easily and without using much space, let me present here the arguments leading to the inevitable conclusion. These are based partly on the abbreviated titles, partly on the personal names.

But let us start with a definition of the *genre* of the inscription: we are clearly dealing with a text belonging to the category of prytany lists, a category which is well attested in Cyzicus exactly in this period. It is true that it is somewhat difficult to get an overview of this material, as there is no modern comprehensive edition of the lists, but one may grasp a good picture of the nature of the texts by having a look at those lists published in *CIG* 3662 ff. and at some of the less fragmentary ones in *AM* (especially *AM* 16 (1891) 438 f. and 26 (1901) 121 ff.). The prytany lists begin with a prescript (e.g. *AM* 26 (1901) 121 ff., A, line 1 ff. Ἰππαρχοῦντος ..., γραμματεῦντος δὲ ..., ἀρχιερέως δὲ τῆς Ἀσίας ναοῦ τ[οῦ] ἐν Κυζίκῳ ..., ἄρχοντος τοῦ καλλίου ..., οἶδε ἐπρυτάνευσαν μῆνα ... καὶ κέκαλλίασαν μῆνα ...).² This is followed by the lists of names. In many cases, persons referred to as μύσται are grouped under this very heading at the end of a given list (e.g. in the inscription mentioned above this happens in line 45 ff.). Among the persons not described as μύσται many have abbreviated titles of the type βασι(λεύς). In the case of most of these titles, the number of people equipped with them varies; however, there does not seem to be a list mentioning more than one ἐπὶ τῶν θυμάτων. Furthermore, there is no list in which one would find all the various titles and, where one finds the more common ones, an exact hierarchy is not easily discernible; one sees, however, that the ἐπὶ τῶν θυμάτων (not appearing in all lists) normally comes after the μυστάρχης and before the βασιλεῖς.³

² The exact nature of a κάλλιον and of the activity referred to usually as καλλιάζω is not clear; cf. N. Ehrhardt, *Milet und seine Kolonien* (1983) 205 with the refs. in nn. 1239 f.

³ Thus in *CIG* 3663, A, 15; *AM* 6 (1881) 43 ff., ii, b 16; *AM* 16 (1891) 438 f., i, line 18; *AM* 26 (1901) 121 ff., A, line 16 ff. (but note e.g. how one person designated as ἱερ. appears in line 12, whereas the rest of the persons with this title appear in line 29 ff.). In *AM* 6 (1881) 43 ff., i, line 26, the ἐπ(ὶ) θυ(μάτων) appears in the middle of persons without titles (but later than the μυστάρχης) and the βασιλεῖς, preceding the μυστάρχης, appear at the head of the list.

Now let us have a look at *I. Prusa 52*, the inscription to be discussed here. In column *a*, the first line which has been preserved opens with [--- Με]νεκράτης μυστάρ(χης). After one line, there is in line 3 [--- Συμ]φόρου (for the restoration cf. line 4) ἐπὶ τῶν θυ(μάτων),⁴ who is followed by five βασιλεῖς (line 4–8); in line 10, we find, as in many prytany lists from Cyzicus, a person described as ἱερ(οφάντης?).⁵ In addition to these, we also find two persons (in lines 2 and 4) referred to as φιλ(ότιμος).⁶ In column *b*, we find the heading μύσται in line 8 and their names in line 9 ff. In column *c*, there is perhaps a μυστάρχης in line 7 and βασιλεῖς at least in lines 11 and 12.

All this would be rather singular in a city like Prusa or, in fact, in practically any city. But if this is another fragment of a prytany list from Cyzicus, all details fit perfectly in with everything that is known from the other lists. It is true that there are some details for which there do not seem to exist parallels in other published prytany lists. However, this is certainly not a problem, since the lists tend to be fairly idiosyncratic and since most of the lists of which larger fragments have been preserved present features of their own, especially in the choice of titles attached to the persons appearing in the lists; one concludes that there was a great number of titles (and their combinations) in use.⁷ In any case, let us have a quick look at the novelties.

⁴ This person (e.g. [Δημήτριος Συμ]φόρου) is thus not a Roman citizen. The person in line 4 may well be a brother.

⁵ Thus H. G. Lolling, *AM* 13 (1888) 309; J. H. Mordtmann, *AM* 16 (1881) 438. (Boeckh in his commentary on *CIG* 3663 [p. 921; repeated by Ehrhardt, *op. cit.* (n. 2) 511 n. 1233] could not know that in inscriptions to be published later this title would appear alone and not followed by φιλ.) Persons with this designation also appear in *CIG* 3663, B, 10; *AM* 16 (1891) 438 f., i, line 19; *AM* 26 (1901) 121 ff. A, lines 12 and 28 ff.

⁶ The abbreviation φιλ., φιλ. φιλολ., appearing in almost all prytany lists, sometimes more or less sporadically here and there (e.g. *CIG* 3662 line 3; *CIG* 3664, i, line 50; ii, line 45. 48; *AM* 6 (1881) 43 ff., iii, 31; *AM* 16 (1891) 438 f., II, col. ii, line 9; col. iii line 4), sometimes in sequences (e.g. *CIG* 3664, ii, lines 16–8 and 23 f.; *AM* 16 (1891) 438 f., I, col. i, lines 6–8; II, col. i, lines 2–12; col. ii, lines 4–6; col. iii, lines 11 f.; *AM* 26 (1901) 121 ff., A, lines 37–40 and 48–50. 52; *JHS* 22 (1902) 205 f. lines 21–9) and attached also to persons included in the lists of μύσται, has been interpreted as φιλ(ότιμος) at least since Boeckh on *CIG* 3662 (although he adds "nec novi melius"). The book of F. W. Hasluck, *Cyzicus* (1910) is not very useful on the prytany lists, which are mentioned only in passing on p. 212 f.

⁷ Cf. H. G. Lolling, *AM* 13 (1888) 309, on the new titles appearing in the inscription quoted here as *AM* 16 (1891) 438 f.; C. Smith and R. de Rustafjaell, *JHS* 22 (1902) 207,

In line 4, we have a βασι(λεύς), φιλ(ότιμος), a combination not yet attested as such. However, we know that some persons could use more than one title (cf. *CIG* 3663, B, line 1 γραμματεὺς καὶ φυλ(άρχης)); and φιλότιμος also often appears in the lists of μύσται, cf. n. 6), and in any case there is a parallel in *CIG* 3663, B, line 10, βασ. καὶ ἱερ. φι. On the other hand, I cannot produce an explanation for the *Y* having been added after βασι. in col. *a*, line 8. Corsten in the commentary on *I. Prusa* 52 thinks (clearly without much enthusiasm) that it might stand for υ(ιός), the result being βασι(λέως) υ(ιός), but I am not sure the son of a *basileus* is needed here; if one operates with the assumption that *Y* stands for υ(ιός), one should perhaps rather think of a mechanical rendering of the latin *f(ilius)* added to names in order to point out that someone is the son of someone else (and often to be translated as "the Younger"). In this case, one should understand βασι(λεὺς) υ(ιός). However, this does not seem very convincing and the presence (apparently) of an inexplicable *I* after the name in line 9 may justify the application of a *non liquet* to these two letters.

There remains (in col. *a*, line 2) the worrying text [---]οίνου ὁ κὲ φιλ. One possible explanation could be that this is an error of the stonecutter and that a name is missing between κὲ and φιλ. (a parallel could be [--- ὁ] καὶ Κλαύδι(ο)ς φι. in *AM* 16 (1891) 438 f., ii, line 2). However, for some reason the prytany lists seem to produce men with extra names introduced by ὁ καὶ mainly in such cases when one has the name of one's father, e.g. Ὁνήσιμος β' ὁ κὲ Τελεσφόρος (*AM* 6 (1881) 43 ff., iii, line 41).⁸ More important is however that we do have a ligature of an *Y* and an *O* here, but not of the last two letters of the filiation but rather of the (alleged) final *Y* and the *O* of the (alleged) ὁ. However, is this really a ligature of an *Y* and an *O*? We have here a straight vertical bar running through the *O*, and this could of course be seen as the lower part of an *Y* (the upper part being placed above the *O*). On the other hand, an *O* with a straight vertical line inside can also be seen as a Φ , and the truth is that, if one pursues this line of thought, one finds that the ligature described above is used regularly in the prytany lists to render a combination of a Φ and a *Y*, not that of an *O* and an

on the inscription published *ibid.* 205 f.

⁸ Cf. *ibid.* line 45; *AM* 16 (1891) 438 f., ii, line 10; *JHS* 24 (1904) 34 f. line 2. On the other hand, note also *CIG* 3664 line 7, [---]πλήτου ὁ καὶ Εὐφήμου, where apparently an adoption is referred to (a similar case can be found in *AM* 26 (1901) 121 ff., B, line 50).

Y.⁹ What is even better, in *CIG* 3663, A, line 14, it is exactly this ligature which appears at the end of the slightly abbreviated title οἰνοφύ(λαξ). So I suggest that, instead of [---]οἴνου ὁ κὲ φιλ., the correct reading in *I. Prusa* 52 should be οἰνοφύ(λαξ) κὲ φιλ., this title again taking us back to Cyzicus.¹⁰

Although I am not sure this is really needed, I would like to conclude by pointing out how well the inscription in Prusa fits in with the material from Cyzicus also from an onomastical point of view. In the list, we find persons with the following nomina: *Aelius* (b 12 f., c 10); *Aurunculeius* (Αὐρουκκλήιος Φούλβι(ο)ς b 4); *Caecina* (Λ. Καικίνα Σωσίβις b 11); *Cassius* (Κ. Κάσσιος Ἰοῦστος b 9); *Cattius* (Μ. Κάττιος Ῥοῦφος c 7); *Claudius* (b 6); *Clodius* (b 2, 14); *Fabius* ([.] Φάβιος Εὔτυχος b 17); *Flavius* (c 13); *Iulius* (four instances; a P. Iulius in b 10); *Luceius* (Λ. Λοκκήιος Κρίσπος c 6); *Messius* (Γ. Μέσσιος Ζώσιμος c 5); *Ogulnius* (Μ. Ὀγόλνιος Ἀγάθων c 8); *Pomponius* (Πομπώνιος Κίσσος b 3); *Vibius* (Βείβιος Ἐρμῆς c 9). Now if one compares these names with the names in the index to *I. Prusa*, one finds that, if this inscription were from Prusa, the following names would be the only instances in Prusa: *Aurunculeius Caecina Cassius Cattius Fabius Iulius* (with the praenomen *P.*) *Luceius Messius Ogulnius Vibius*. Things change very much if one considers this to be an inscription from Cyzicus; indeed, except for *Aurunculeius Cattius* and *Ogulnius*, which I think now make their entrance into the repertory of Roman *nomina* in Cyzicus, all of the above names are attested in inscriptions from the same city published previously.¹¹

⁹ Cf. *CIG* 3663, B, line 5; *AM* 6 (1881) 43 ff., iii, line 5 (with the facsimile between pp. 44 and 45); *AM* 16 (1891) 437 f., I, col. i, line 16 and 20; II, col. iii, line 17 (see the facsimile in *AM* 13 (1888), between pp. 304 and 305). In these cases this ligature is used in the expressions φύλαρχος and ὑφάντης.

¹⁰ For the use of κέ (the ligature may perhaps also be regarded as a symbol of sorts representing καί), cf. *CIG* 3663, B, lines 1 and 10.

¹¹ *Caecina*: there are many instances (with the praenomen *L.* *I. Kyzikos* I 433; *AM* 16 (1891) 437 f., I, col. i, line 21). *Cassius*: *CIG* 3662, line 9; *CIG* 3664, col. ii, line 37; *AM* 26 (1901) 121 ff., B, line 63; *JHS* 22 (1902) 204 ff., lines 13 and 36. The praenomen *Quintus* does not seem to have been attested previously. *Fabius*: *CIG* 3664, col. ii, line 48. *Iulius* (with the praenomen *P.*): *JHS* 22 (1902) 204 ff. line 34. *Luceius*: *CIG* 3662, line 7 (*L.*); *CIG* 3665, col. i, lines 42 f.; *AM* 26 (1901) 121 ff., A, line 17; *JHS* 24 (1904) 34 f. (*L.*); *BMC* Mysia 58 no. 280. *Messius*: *AM* 16 (1891) 437 f., I, col. ii, line 24; *AM* 26 (1901) 121 ff., B, line 52 (?) (*C.*). *Vibius*: there are many instances in the prytany lists (note also e.g. *CIG* 3661; *I. Kyzikos* I 389). Note furthermore that *Pomponius*, attested in

My conclusion is, then, that *I. Prusa* 52 must be regarded as originating in Cyzicus and that it represents a category well-known there, that of the prytany lists. As the stone is not described as having been inscribed on both sides (a characteristic peculiar to many of the lists), it belongs to the same category as e.g. *AM* 6 (1881) 42 f. no. 1; *ib.* 43 ff. no. 2; and (possibly) *CIG* 3662. For inscriptions from Cyzicus which have ended up in Bursa, cf. e.g. *I. Kyzikos* I 2. 30. 34. 38. 45. 54 etc.; *SEG* 41, 1079, 1082; 43, 898.

University of Helsinki

Prusa, is also attested in Cyzicus (*CIG* 3663, A, lines 13 and 15; possibly *AM* 16 (1891) 437 f., II, col. ii, line 9). As for the names now attested also in Cyzicus, *Aurunculeius* was previously known only in Ephesus (*I. Ephesos* 3016), *Cattius* in Thessalonica (*SEG* 43, 462; cf. *Cattianus* in Antandrus, *SEG* 46, 1559), *Ogulnius* in Ephesus (*I. Ephesos* 1629), Philippi (*BCH* 61 (1937) 419 no. 14) and Delos (*I. Delos* 2354bis, a latish inscription).