



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 21, 2006

2006

HOLZHAUSEN



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 21

2006


H O L Z H A U S E N

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Gemeinsam mit:

Wolfgang Hameter und Hans Taeuber

Unter Beteiligung von:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Franziska Beutler, Sandra Hodeček, Georg Rehrenböck und Patrick Sänger

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.
Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien
maggoschitz@holzhausen.at

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob.Barbara 8.

© 2007 by Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Wien

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar

Eigentümer und Verleger: Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien
Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien,
Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.
e-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder Bernhard.Palme@univie.ac.at
Hersteller: Holzhausen Druck & Medien GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien
Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Amin B e n a i s s a (Oxford): An Oxyrhynchite Sale on Delivery from the Reign of Mauricius (Tafel 1)	1
Cédric B r é l a z (Athen): L'archonte stéphanéphore et la Tyché de Lébadée (Tafel 2)	11
Alain D e l a t t r e (Brüssel): Un extrait d'un sermon de Grégoire de Nysse en copte (Tafeln 3–4)	29
Herbert H e f t n e r (Wien): Der Beginn von Sullas Proskriptionen	33
Angela K a l i n o w s k i (Saskatoon): Of Stones and Stonecutters: Reflections on the Genesis of Two Parallel Texts from Ephesos (IvE 672 and 3080) (Tafeln 5–6)	53
Bernd M. K r e i l e r (Planegg): Der Prokonsul Lentulus, der Imperator Murena und der Proquästor Lucullus	73
Thomas K r u s e (Heidelberg): Der Gaustratege im römischen Ägypten. Bemerkungen zu einem neuen Buch	83
Christa M a y e r (Wien): Die Weihinschriften zur Verleihung der ersten Kaiserneokorie an Ephesos (IvE II 232–235, 237–242; V 1498; VI 2048): Das Schriftbild (Tafeln 7–15)	117
Mischa M e i e r (Tübingen): Probleme der Thukydides-Interpretation und das Perikles-Bild des Historikers	131
Fritz M i t t h o f (Wien): Ein neues Formular für die Diokletianische Ära (Tafel 16)	169
Patrick S ä n g e r (Wien): P.Berol. 21684: Lohnquittung für Eirenarchen (Tafel 17)	173
Daniela S u m m a (Berlin): Stela sepulcralis infantium (Tafel 18)	177
Ekkehard W e b e r (Wien): Die römischen Meilensteine von Rätien und Noricum. Zum neuen Faszikel des CIL XVII	181
Bemerkungen zu Papyri XIX (<Korr. Tyche> 527–543)	195
Buchbesprechungen	205
Leonhard A. B u r c k h a r d t, <i>Bürger und Soldaten. Aspekte der politischen und militärischen Rolle athenischer Bürger im Kriegswesen des 4. Jh. v. Chr.</i> , Stuttgart 1996 (P. Siewert: 205) — Antonio C a r l i n i et al., <i>Studi sulla tradizione del testo di Isocrate</i> , Florenz 2003 (B. G. Mandilaras: 206) — Boris D r e y e r, <i>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätclassischen Athen (322 – ca. 230 v. Chr.)</i> , Stuttgart 1999 (P. Siewert: 210) — Werner E c k, Matthäus H e i l, <i>Senatores populi Romani. Realität und mediale Präsentation einer Führungsschicht</i> , Stuttgart 2005 (E. Weber: 211) — Johannes H a h n, <i>Gewalt und religiöser Konflikt. Studien zu den Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Christen, Heiden und Juden im Osten des Römischen Reiches (von Konstantin bis Theodosius II.)</i> , Berlin 2004 (J. Losehand: 214) — Irmaud H e i t m e i e r, <i>Das Inntal. Siedlungs- und Raumentwicklung eines Alpentaales</i>	

im Schnittpunkt der politischen Interessen von der römischen Okkupation bis in die Zeit Karls des Großen, Innsbruck 2005 (A. Picker: 217) — Martin J e h n e, *Die Römische Republik. Von der Gründung bis Caesar*, München 2006 (S. Hodeček: 220) — Gabrielle K r e m e r, *Die rundplastischen Skulpturen*, in: Werner J o b s t (Hrsg.), *Das Heiligtum des Jupiter Optimus Maximus auf dem Pfaffenberg/Carnuntum II*, Wien 2004 (J. Auinger: 221) — Michel M a l a i s e, *Pour une terminologie et une analyse des cultes isiaques*, Brüssel 2005 (G. Hölbl: 224) — Hans J. N i s s e n, *Geschichte Altvorderasiens*, München 1999 (P. Siewert: 227) — Paula P e r l m a n, *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece. The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*, Göttingen 2000 (P. Siewert: 228) — Hans-Albert R u p p r e c h t (Hrsg.), *Symposion 2003. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Rauischholzhausen, 30. September – 3. Oktober 2003)*, Wien 2006 (Ph. Scheibelreiter: 229) — Manfred G. S c h m i d t, *Einführung in die lateinische Epigraphik*, Darmstadt 2004 (Th. Pantzer: 232) — Rainer V o l l k o m m e r (Hrsg.), Doris V o l l k o m m e r - G l ö k l e r (Red.), *Künstlerlexikon der Antike Bd. I: A–K, Bd. II: L–Z. Addendum A–K*, München 2001 und 2004 (M. Donderer: 233)

Indices	237
Gesamtregister zu den Bänden 11–20	241
Eingelange Bücher	249
Tafeln 1–18	

ANGELA KALINOWSKI

Of Stones and Stonecutters
Reflections on the Genesis of Two Parallel Texts from Ephesos
(IvE 672 and 3080)

Tafeln 5–6

The inscriptions museum located in the vaulted substructures of the Temple of the Flavian emperors at Ephesos houses numerous inscriptions found on the site of the ancient city¹. Although it is not currently accessible to the general public, curious tourists may peek through iron gates to see a selection of mostly honorific monuments. The inscriptions under consideration in this paper, IvE 672 and IvE 3080, are located in close proximity to one another in the museum; however, one might easily pass over them without noticing their close connection. Both are bases which were part of statue monuments set up to honour the famous Ephesian benefactor and sophist, Titus Flavius Damianus², for a series of activities undertaken when he was

A grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada financed this research. Numerous individuals and institutions deserve thanks: Friedrich Krinzinger, director of the Austrian Archaeological Institute, for permission to work with the squeezes and Skizzenbücher in Vienna; the Director and staff of the Efes Müzesi for providing access to, and assistance with the monuments in the inscriptions museum. Versions of this paper were presented at the Hauskolloquium of the Institute for Classical Archaeology in Vienna, and to the Classical, Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies research colloquium, University of Saskatchewan. I benefited from advice of Guy Chamberland, Dieter Knibbe, John Porter, P. Michael Swan. Special thanks to Hans Taeuber for his invaluable advice on all Ephesian epigraphic matters, including this paper. Any errors remain my responsibility.

Abbreviations:

FiE = *Forschungen in Ephesos*, 1906ff.

IvE = *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* Ia–VIII,2 (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 11.1–17.4) Bonn, 1979–1984.

McLean, *Greek Epigraphy* = B. H. McLean, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy for the Hellenistic and Roman periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine, 323 B.C. – A.D. 337*, Ann Arbor 2002.

Susini, *Roman Stonecutter* = G. Susini, *The Roman Stonecutter: An Introduction to Latin epigraphy*, trans. A. M. Dabrowski, Oxford 1973.

¹ The selection of the inscriptions was made by Dieter Knibbe in 1982 at the request of Turkish General Authority for Antiquities; the museum remained open until 1998 (Dieter Knibbe, pers. comm. 30 August 2006).

² *PIR*² F 253. His career and family relationships are established through a number of Ephesian inscriptions: IvE 672, 672A, 672B (?), 676A, 678, 735, 811, 2001, 3029, 3051, 3080, 3081. A short biography in Philostratus discusses briefly his sophistic career and at greater length his enormous wealth and generosity (Philostr. soph. 2.23). Archaeo-

grammateus or secretary of the *demos*. They have been securely dated to 166/167 because they refer to the fact that Damianus received at Ephesos legions returning from the successful Parthian campaign of Lucius Verus³. Beyond linking them to this important event in the history of the Roman Empire, these statue bases have been subjected to little scrutiny, although on closer examination they prove to be rich sources for Ephesian history and for the study of the technical aspects of epigraphy.

What is most interesting about IvE 672 and IvE 3080 is that they are parallel texts. While they are very similar to one another in content and phraseology, they were erected by different collectives identified by Ephesian toponyms and also, they differ from one another in physical form. They urge reflection on aspects of the genesis of epigraphic monuments, a subject which scholars have debated for over a century. How did two different groups come to erect virtually the same text? How did the same text come to appear so different on each stone? By studying the physical forms of the stones, the organization of the text on each, and their minute textual differences, we may reconstruct the process by which these two texts were composed,

logical ex-cavations by John Turtle Wood in the 1860s revealed portions of the famous 'stoa' linking the city to the Artemision which Philostratus said Damianus built, J. T. Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, London 1877. Further archaeological investigations have been undertaken under the auspices of the Austrian Archaeological Institute: D. Knibbe, G. Langmann (ed.), *Via Sacra Ephesiaca I* (Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Berichte und Materialien 3), Vienna 1993; D. Knibbe, H. Thür (ed.), *Via Sacra Ephesiaca II* (Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Berichte und Materialien 6), Vienna 1995; M. Steskal, K. Grossschmidt, M. Heinz, F. Kanz, H. Taeuber, *Die Damianosstoa in Ephesos. Bericht über die Ausgrabung 2002 im Abschnitt Kathodos III*, ÖJh 72 (2003) 241–273. On climatic reasons for the stoa's construction see W. Vetters, H. Zabełlicky, *Eine Klimakatastrophe um 200 n. Chr. und ihre archäologisch-historische Nachweisbarkeit*, in: M. Frey, N. Hanel (ed.), *Archäologie-Naturwissenschaften-Umwelt. Beiträge der Arbeitsgemeinschaft "Römische Archäologie" auf dem 3. Deutschen Archäologenkongress in Heidelberg 25. 5. – 30. 5. 1999* (BAR International Series 929), Oxford 2001, 9–12.

³ G. Alföldy, H. Halfmann, *Iunius Maximus und die Victoria Parthica*, ZPE 35 (1979) 195–212. This article presents the most sustained analysis of the inscriptions under consideration here, however its main focus is the identification of the man who is honoured in another Ephesian inscription, IvE 811. On the basis of the office of tribune held by the honored individual and especially his *munus* of bringing the news of the victory [*suscipientem*] *munus* [*laureatum*] to Rome, the authors identified him with the Iunius Maximus who, as tribune, announced the victory over the Parthians to the Roman senate, and is discussed at length in a letter of Fronto to Avidius Cassius (ad amicos 1.6). The Greek part of IvE 811, indicating that T. Flavius Damianus as *grammateus* of the *demos* and *panegyriarch*, paid for the monument to Iunius Maximus allowed the authors to connect it with IvE 672 and IvE 3080, which honour him for, among other things, the fact that he received the troops passing through Ephesos after the Parthian war during the time he was *grammateus* of the *demos*. Alföldy and Halfmann propose that the appointment of Iunius Maximus was connected with coordinating all aspects of the return of the troops through the province of Asia, since he was clearly a man with personal knowledge of the units and officers in question. It is under such circumstances that Damianus and Iunius Maximus met: a wealthy citizen offering his services, especially his material aid, to the troops via the quaestor, Iunius Maximus.

and how they were transferred to the stones⁴. Although each inscription was commissioned by a different collective, their linguistic similarities indicate that they both derived from a single decree of the *boule* and the *demos* of Ephesos. Although their immediate physical aspects are diverse, when more closely examined, they show great similarities in the arrangement of the text on the stones, indicating that they were made in the same workshop. However, it is debatable whether they were made by the same stonecutter. Furthermore, by closely examining the stones and texts, I believe I can show that IvE 672 was arranged and carved before, and served as a model for IvE 3080, and in doing so shed light on the thought processes of the anonymous artisan(s) working in the *officina* which produced these two inscriptions.

The texts and their contents

IvE 672 and 3080 are honorific bases. Both were found in early 20th c. excavations reused as building materials in later walls. IvE 672 was built into a wall near the Octogon on the Kuretenstrasse in front of Hanghaus 1, while IvE 3080 formed part of a late wall built in the NE corner of the Tetragonos agora⁵. No evidence exists indicating where each monument was originally erected, and whether, because they are parallel texts, they were erected close to one another. Indeed, their great similarity in content — which we will review immediately below — indicates that they were part of a series of statues set up to honour T. Flavius Damianus for the same benefactions⁶. This opens interesting possibilities for interpretation of collective action in Ephesos by groups other than the *boule*, *demos*, tribes and workers' associations⁷.

Let us briefly review the substance of the inscriptions and consider the main differences between them in terms of content:

⁴ Works whose focus has been specifically the genesis of inscriptions in Latin: R. Cagnat, *Inscriptiones*, in: *DS* 3, 528–545. Jean Mallon has been especially important in linking the methods of Latin paleography to epigraphy: J. Mallon, *Paléographie romaine*, Madrid 1952; id., *Paléographie des papyrus d'Égypte et des inscriptions du monde romain*, *Museum Helveticum* 10 (1953) 141–160; 775–777; id., *Pierres fautives*, Libya: archéologie, épigraphie 2 (1954) 187–199; 435–459; id., *L'ordinatio des inscriptions*, CRAI 1955, 126–136; id., *Scriptoria épigraphiques*, *Scriptorium* 11 (1957) 177–194. See also J. S. and A. E. Gordon, *Contributions to the Palaeography of Latin Inscriptions*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1957 and G. Susini, *The Roman Stonecutter: An Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*, trans. A. M. Dabrowski, Oxford 1973. For Greek inscriptions: L. Robert *passim* but especially, *Épigraphie et Paléographie*, CRAI 1955, 195–219 = *Opera Minora Selecta* I, Amsterdam 1969, 576–600; S. Tracy, *The Lettering of an Athenian Mason* (*Hesperia Supplement* 15), Princeton NJ 1975; B. H. McLean, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy for the Hellenistic and Roman periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine, 323 B.C.–A.D. 337*, Ann Arbor 2002.

⁵ On the discovery of IvE 672 along with several other inscriptions see R. Heberdey, *IX. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Grabungen in Ephesos, 1907–1911*, *ÖJh* 15 (1912) Beibl. 164–165. On IvE 3080 see W. Wilberg, *FiE* III, Vienna, 1923, 2.

⁶ Two other inscriptions, IvE 672 A and B, have been associated with these and will be discussed below, p. 61–63.

⁷ A. Kalinowski, *Toponyms in IvE 672 and IvE 3080: Interpreting Collective Action in Honorific Inscriptions from Ephesos*, *ÖJh* 75 (2006), forthcoming.

IvE 672⁸ (Tafel 5)

1 Τ(ίτον) Φλάουιον Δαμμιανόν,
 2 γραμματεύσαντα ἐ[πι-]
 3 φανῶς καὶ μετρήσαν[τα]
 4 μυριάδας μεδίμων [εἴ]-
 5 κοσι καὶ χειλίους δια[κοσί-]
 6 ους μηνσὶν δεκατρισὶν [ύ-]
 7 λοις καὶ ὑποδεξάμενο[ν ἐν]
 8 τούτοις στρατόπεδα τὰ ἀπὸ τ[ῆς]
 9 κατὰ Πάρθων νείκης ὑποστ[ρέ-]
 10 φοντα καὶ πανηγυριαρχήσ[αν-]
 11 τα κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν μεγάλων [’Ε-]
 12 φεσῆων ἐκτενῶς καὶ ἔργον ὑπο-
 13 σχόμενον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτῷ οἶ-
 14 κον ἐν τῷ Οὐαρίου βαλανείῳ μ[ε-]
 15 τὰ οἰκοδομῆς καὶ παντὸς κόσ-
 16 μου καὶ μυριάδας ποιήσαντα
 17 περισσὰς ἐκ τῶν προσόδων τῆς
 18 ἰδίας γραμματείας τῇ πόλει
 19 δεκαδύο καὶ ἑπτακισχέιλια ὀ-
 20 κτακόσια δεκαἕξ.
 21 ἀναστησάντων τὴν τειμὴν
 22 παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ
 23 ἀνδρὸς τοῦ κατὰ πάντα
 24 ἀσυνκρίτου.

1. 14. Οὐαρίου not Οὐαρίῳ (IvE III, p. 69).

1. 22. παρ’ αὐτῶν not παρ’ αὐτῶν (IvE III, p. 69). In the initial publication of the text, Heberdey recognized the not unusual contraction of the initial vowels of ἑαυτῶν into αὐτῶν⁹. The erroneous αὐτῶν published in IvE is likely the result of the very rapid preparation of the publication and was overlooked in proof reading. It is ungrammatical and difficult to construe, while παρ’ αὐτῶν, meaning ‘from their own resources’, with a genitive absolute indicating who put up the honour is paralleled in other inscriptions¹⁰.

⁸ The texts of IvE 672 and IvE 3080 printed here are both based on my readings of the stones in Ephesos in September 2005. The right hand side of IvE 672 now has slightly more damage than appears in the text printed in H. Engelmann, D. Knibbe, R. Merkelbach, *IvE III*, p. 68–69.

⁹ Heberdey, (n. 5) *Beibl.* 165.

¹⁰ IvE 642 describes the person who erected an honorific monument for L. Claudius Charidemus Philometer as follows (ll. 13–16): τὸν ἀνδριάντα ἀναστήσαντος παρ’

“[The boule and the demos honour] T. Flavius Damianus who performed the office of secretary conspicuously, and measured out 201,200 measures (of grain) for thirteen whole months, and received at this time the legions returning from the victory against the Parthians, and zealously at the same time was president of the great Ephesia, and promised a structure in the same year, a hall in the baths of Varius with the architecture and all of the decoration, and he made for the city a surplus of 127,816 (denarii) from the revenues of his own term as secretary.

From their own funds, those in the agora (who are supporters) of a man incomparable in all respects set up this honour”.

IvE 3080 (Tafel 6)

- 1 Τ(ίτον) Φλ(άουιον) Δαμιανὸν
- 2 τὸν ἴδιον εὐεργέτην καὶ
- 3 ἐν πᾶσιν ἀσύγκριτον ἢ
- 4 πλατεῖα, γραμματεύσαντα
- 5 ἐπιφανῶς καὶ μετρήσαντα
- 6 μυριάδας μεδίμων κ' καὶ
- 7 ,ασ' μηνὶν ἰγ' ὄλοις, καὶ ὑπο-
- 8 δεξάμενον ἐν τούτοις στρα-
- 9 τόπεδα ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Πάρθων
- 10 νείκης ὑποστρέφοντα, καὶ
- 11 πανηγυριαρχήσαντα κατὰ
- 12 τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν μεγάλων Ἐφεσῆ-
- 13 ῶν ἐκτενῶς, καὶ ἔργον ὑποσχό-
- 14 μενον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτῷ οἶ-
- 15 κων ἐν τῷ Οὐαρίῳ βαλανείῳ
- 16 μετὰ οἰκοδομῆς καὶ παντὸς
- 17 κόσμου, καὶ μυριάδας ποιή-
- 18 σαντα περισσείας ἐκ τῶν
- 19 προσόδων τῆς ἰδίας γραμ-
- 20 ματείας τῇ πόλει ἰβ' ,ζωις'
- 21 ἐπιμεληθέντος τῆς ἀνασ-
- 22 τάσεως τῆς τειμῆς Γ(αίου) Λικινίου
- 23 Ἄτειμήτου Αὐρηλιανοῦ νο-
- 24 ποιοῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ γραμμα-
- 25 τέως τῆς Ἀσίας ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

ἐαυτοῦ Τιβεριοῦ Κλ. | Πολυδεύκουσ Μαρκέλλου | τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. IvE 951 uses a similar construction to identify who put up the inscription, (ll. 11–16): ... τὴν τιμὴν | ἀναστήσαντας παρ' ἐαυτοῦ | Μ. Φλ. Δομετιανοῦ φιλοσεβ. | ἑοῦ ἀσιάρχου καὶ ἀσιάρχου, | ἐκδίκου τῆς κρατίστης | Ἐφεσίων βουλῆς. παρ' ἐαυτοῦ has the same meaning as the more common ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.

1. 7. $\eta\gamma$ not γ (IvE VII,1 p. 82); 1. 23. Ἀτειμήτου not Ἀρτειμήτου (IvE VII,1, p. 83); 1. 23–24. νοποιοῦ not νεοποιοῦ (IvE VII, 1 p. 83)

“The plateia (honours) T. Flavius Damianus, their own benefactor and a man incomparable in all respects; he performed the office of secretary conspicuously, and measured out 201,200 measures (of grain) for thirteen whole months, and received at this time the legions returning from the victory against the Parthians, and zealously at the same time was president of the great Ephesia, and promised a structure in the same year, a hall in the Varius baths, with the architecture and all of the decoration, and he made for the city a surplus of 127,816 (denarii) from the revenues of his own term as *grammateus*. G. Licinius Ateimetos Aurelianus, *neopoios* of Artemis and secretary of Asia of the temples in Ephesos, took charge of setting up of this honour”.

In its current state, IvE 672 begins with the name of the man honored, T. Flavius Damianus and lists the many benefactions he performed during his time as *grammateus* or secretary of the *demos*. By the 2nd century CE, the *grammateus* of the *demos* was the most important of Ephesos’ several *grammateis*, introducing to the assembly meetings proposals for approval, and having financial duties¹¹. Damianus provided 201,200 *medimnoi* of grain¹² over a period of thirteen months. This was grain probably ear-marked for the legions of Lucius Verus which, returning victorious from the Parthian campaign, were to pass through Ephesos¹³. Damianus also was *panegyriarch* of the Great Ephesia¹⁴, providing funding for the staging of the festival over and above the 4500 *denarii* limit for expenditures from civic or temple funds set down in the edict of Paullus Fabius Persicus (A.D. 44)¹⁵. Damianus also promised to build and decorate a hall (οἶκος) in the baths of Varius, which were built in the Hadrianic period by P. Quintilius Valens Varius¹⁶. He also contributed to civic coffers 127,816

¹¹ C. Schulte, *Die Grammateis von Ephesos*, Stuttgart 1994, 40–41.

¹² 1 medimnos = 51.84 litres or 11.4 gallons. 201,200 medimnoi = 10,430,208 litres or 2,293,680 gallons of grain.

¹³ Alföldy and Halfmann, (n. 3) 209–210; B. Peuch, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d’époque impériale* (Textes et traditions 4), Paris 2002, 193 and n. 2.

¹⁴ The Ephesia was a festival of Artemis with accompanying games. It has been argued that it was not the same as the Artemisia, but was rather a penteteric festival on a regional rather than a local scale. This has been confirmed by a decree of the Dionysian *technitai* for T. Aelius Alcibiades (IvE 22, 42) which calls the Great Ephesia a penteteric *agon*. The edict of Paullus Fabius Persicus, dated to A.D. 44, limits the amount of funds to be spent from civic or temple coffers to 4500 denarii (IvE 18d, 3–4). Inscriptions honouring victors refer to τὰ μεγάλα ἱερὰ ἰσελαστικά Ἐφεσῆα (IvE 1106 and 1130), which is probably the same festival. Most of the inscriptions referring to the Ephesia are honorific: several are for *panegyriarchs* of the Ephesia (IvE 672, 728, 811, 3080, 1080B, 3014, 3080); several for athletes victorious in the Ephesia (IvE 1123, 1132 for the ἀνδρῶν διαυλόν, 2072); some honour *agonothetes* of the festival: IvE 627, 2067, 3056, 3072; there is a single reference to an εἰσαγωγὸν τῶν μεγάλων Ἐφεσῆων.

¹⁵ IvE 17–19.

¹⁶ IvE 455, 500. Although the inscription does not employ the Greek word for renovation, Philostratus in his biography of Damianus indicates that the latter had restored

denarii of unspent revenue from his term as *grammateus* of the *demos*¹⁷. Presumably, this was a remarkable event, with most *grammateis* fully spending any civic revenues acquired by the city during their term of office, or putting the balance sheet in the red. This would surely have received the notice of imperial authorities who were very conscious of financial mismanagement by magistrates in the cities of the Roman empire¹⁸. The last four lines of IvE 672 indicate who commissioned and paid for the monument: ἀναστησάντων τὴν τειμὴν | παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ | ἀνδρὸς τοῦ κατὰ πάντα ἀσυνκρίτου.

Like IvE 672, IvE 3080 in its current state begins with the name of T. Flavius Damianus, but similarities between the two texts cease for the next few lines. Immediately after his name, IvE 3080 indicates who erected the honour: τὸν ἴδιον εὐεργέτην καὶ | ἐν πᾶσιν ἀσύνκριτον ἢ | πλατεῖα. By contrast, IvE 672 after naming Damianus, contains the recitation of his benefactions and leaves the identification of who put up the inscription to the very end of the text. IvE 3080 does not begin the list of benefactions until line 4. But what is most remarkable are the similarities between the texts after the first few lines. IvE 3080 lists in the same order as the IvE 672, in almost identical language, and following the same sense units, the benefactions that Damianus undertook when he was *grammateus* of the *demos*. I will discuss this in detail below. The most likely explanation for this is two fold: first, both inscriptions stemmed from the same original document, which I suggest was a decree of the *boule* and the *demos*; and second, both commissions were undertaken by the same workshop, with one inscription serving as a model for the other.

A decree of the *boule* and the *demos*

The type of benefactions for which T. Flavius Damianus is honored reinforces the suggestion that these honours were based on a decree of *boule* and the *demos*. Damianus' benefactions profited the city of Ephesos as a whole, and not just the collectives named in these inscriptions. His provision of food for the army of Lucius Verus must have certainly relieved rich of Ephesos of the financial burden of feeding thousands of hungry soldiers, and relieved the poor of the very real fear of starvation. His construction of the hall in the baths of Varius, one of the public baths located very centrally on the Kuretenstrasse quite near its intersection with the Marmorstrasse, was surely also a general public benefit¹⁹. Also, the revenues which Damianus saved during his term as *grammateus* are recorded in both inscriptions as 'for the city', τῇ πόλει. Indeed, the very precise expressions of the quantities of grain for the army and

civic buildings that had fallen down: καὶ τὰ ὑποδεδωκότα τῶν δημοσίων ἀνακτόμενος (Philostr. soph. 2.23).

¹⁷ Schulte, (n. 11) 40–42 for the financial responsibilities of the *grammateus* of the *demos*.

¹⁸ The decree Paullus Fabius Persicus mentioned above was concerned with correcting mismanagement by civic officials of temple funds. See also Plin. epist. 10 *passim*.

¹⁹ Puech, (n. 13) 194, suggests that the people of the *plateia* particularly benefited from Damianus' building in the Varius baths because she identifies the *plateia* with the Embolos/Kuretenstrasse, but see my forthcoming article, Kalinowski (n. 7).

money for the city that Damianus provided also strongly reinforce the idea that IvE 672 and 3080 were not only inspired by a decree of the *boule* and the *demos*, but that their texts directly derived from such a decree.

The argument that these two monuments resulted from a single decree of the *boule* and the *demos* is also based on the premise that both may be incomplete. Each is missing a plinth to which the statue of the benefactor was attached²⁰. Indeed, the reuse of so many honorific bases in later walls and constructions in Ephesos resulted in the separation of middle portions of bases from their plinths, and the separation of plinths from statues, so this is not surprising. The records in the epigraphic *Skizzenbücher* housed in the Austrian Archaeological Institute in Vienna, indicate that the first editors of the stones, Josef Keil and Rudolf Heberdey, were quite aware of this since each stone is described as a '*Basis- Mittelstück*'. More importantly, at least one of the texts is incomplete. Although Keil thought that IvE 3080 could be grammatically complete as it stood, he preferred to restore a plinth inscribed with a formulaic prescript, such as ψηφισαμένης τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, 'the *boule* and the *demos* decreed'²¹. He proposed this particular formula rather than the much more typical τῆς πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ δις νεωκόρου Σεβαστῶν Ἐφεσίων πόλεως ἢ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐτείμησαν, 'the *boule* and the *demos* of the first and greatest metropolis of Asia, of the twice imperial neokorate city of the Ephesians honoured ...' because of the grammatical difficulty posed by having two nominative subjects, the *boule* and the *demos* on the restored plinth, and ἡ πλατεῖα, preserved on the main part of the inscription. Either type of prescript may be correct, although the latter combined with another nominative subject is rare²². IvE 672 almost certainly did have a prescript inscribed on the lost plinth even though, rather remarkably, Heberdey did not restore one²³. The text is grammatically incomplete as it is because it lacks a nominative subject. If the two monuments were part of a series of statues erected at the same time, as I have suggested above, then the context of their initial genesis through a decree of the *boule* and the *demos* would have been evident both from the text of IvE 672, containing the prescript, and also in the recent memories of those who viewed the monuments, some of whom were certainly at the meetings of the *boule* or the *demos* when the decree was put forth.

Two other inscriptions appear to be linked to IvE 672 and 3080 and may provide evidence for another statue monument for Damianus, and possibly evidence of the decree. IvE 672A, like IvE 3080, was found in the Tetragonos agora. It is very frag-

²⁰ IvE 672 has a small square dowel hole in the middle of a worked rectangle on the top of the base. IvE 3080 has no evidence of holes on top (Personal observation, September 2005). However, the absence of dowel holes should not be taken to mean that there was no plinth, since such an absence is evident on numerous bases from Ephesos which certainly did have plinths for statues.

²¹ J. Keil, *Die Inschriften*, in: *FiE* III, Vienna 1923, 161.

²² IvE 625 has two nominatives, one of which is the *boule* and the *demos*, with the verb understood, while the second nominative names the persons who promised the honour, the *prytanis* M. Aurelius Statilius Stratonikeios.

²³ Heberdey, (n. 5) Beibl. 164–165.

mentary and is reconstructed from two pieces of stone (the letters preserved on the stone are printed in bold below for ease of reading)²⁴:

- 1 [τῆς πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης]
- 2 [μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ β']
- 3 [νεωκόρ]ου τῶν [Σεβαστῶν]
- 4 [Ἐφεσίων] πόλεω[ς ἢ βουλή]
- 5 [καὶ] ὁ δῆμος ἐτ[είμησαν]
- 6 [Φλ(άουιον) Δ]αμια^νὸν
- 7 [ὑπὲρ] φιλοτειμιῶν.

Based on the surviving letters πόλεω[, and ὁ δῆμος ἐτ[(ll. 4–5), the first five lines are reasonably restored to render the formulaic prescript indicating that the *boule* and the *demos* honour an individual. In line 6, the name Damianus — only the *delta* is missing — is also sensibly restored. In line 7, the word φιλοτειμιῶν is complete. Thus, in this inscription the *boule* and the *demos* do appear to honour Damianus. The width of this inscription as restored is suitable for a statue base text. It is tempting to connect this inscription to IvE 672 and 3080: all three inscriptions were inscriptions on statue monuments generated by the same decree of the *boule* and the *demos*. Evidently, this is what the editors of *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* thought when they numbered the fragmentary text 672A.

IvE 672B is another very fragmentary text discovered in the early 20th century and whose findspot is not clear:

] . [γραμμα-]

[τεύσαντα ἐπιφανῶς μῆνας δε]κατρεῖ[ς ὄλους καὶ ἀναλώσαν-]
 [τα ἀσυγκρίτως τοὺς ἰδίους] πόρους [γραμμα-]
 [καὶ μετρήσαντα μεδίμων μυ]ριάδας εἴ[κοσι καὶ χιλίους]
 [διακοσίους καὶ ὑποδεξάμενον] τάγματα [τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Πάρ-]
 [θων νίκης ὑποστρέφοντα] εἰνα[

Werner Eck suggested that the preserved letters show clear connection with IvE 672 and 3080, and it is on this that the restoration printed in *Inschriften von Ephesos* is based²⁵. For example, the preserved]κατερεῖ[may quite easily be restored to δεκατερεῖς, and]ριάδας εἴ[to μυ]ριάδας εἴ[κοσι, both of which phrases appear in IvE 672 and IvE 3080, referring respectively to the number of months that Damianus was *grammateus* and the amount of grain he provided. Although the restoration in *Inschriften von Ephesos* is speculative, it is worth noting that the text as restored is much wider than a statue base inscription would be. In his notes in the *Skizzenbuch*, Rudolf Heberdey linked IvE 672B with Inv. nr. 107, noting that they showed great simi-

²⁴ The two fragments were found separately in the Tetragonos agora. Keil illustrated them in the *Skizzenbücher* as numbers 1524 and 1577; put together, they form IvE 672A.

²⁵ Engelmann, Knibbe, Merkelbach, (n. 8) 70.

larities in material and in hand; the implication appears to be that they belonged to the same monument²⁶. Notably, Inv. nr. 107 is a very fragmentary decree of the *boule* and the *demos*. If these two inscriptions are connected, we may speculate that IvE 672B may be all that remains of the decree of the *boule* and the *demos* which motivated the erection of statue monuments IvE 672, 672A and 3080.

Although Prusa is not Ephesos, and a difference of about sixty years separates Dio Chrysostom's *floruit* from the events that we are dealing with here, his political orations shed light on the role of specific individuals, and of the *boule* and the *demos* in the creation of honorific monuments²⁷. Oration 44, delivered in the assembly at Prusa is concerned with honours that Prusans proposed to grant Dio shortly after his return from exile. He modestly announces to his fellow citizens in the assembly that he has no need of statues, or proclamations, or seats of honour. Following this *recusatio*, Dio indicates that various *individuals* had proposed the honours for him before that body, but that he would refrain from praising them for their generous words, since many of them are his kinsmen²⁸. This gives us a glimpse of the process by which honorific decrees were generated. Honours were proposed by individuals of some status, in the present case Dio's relatives who were like him members of the civic elite. A further step is that the *boule* first considered any proposals before they were brought to the assembly²⁹. After the approval of the *boule*, the matter was presented by the *grammateus* for the vote of the *demos*.

Similar processes likely underlay the genesis of IvE 672 and 3080. First, Damianus performed outstanding acts benefitting the entire community during the year that he was *grammateus* of the *demos*. Second, a proposal to honour him was presented to the *boule*. Surviving decrees from Ephesos, or records of such decrees preserved in other types of documents, show the *stratego*i and the *grammateus* of the *demos* active in bringing matters forward for consideration, as for example in IvE 614c ll. 2–4: ... ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ φιλοσεβάστω· περὶ ὧν ἐνεφάνισαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου Ἀπολλώνιος Μηνογένους. IvE 619A and B record Aelius Tatianus, who is named but without any offices 'taking thought for' the honouring of a proconsul and his wife (ll. 11ff.): καθὼς ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμο[ς] ἐνηφίσαντο προνοησαμένου Αἰλίου Τατιανοῦ φιλοσεβάστου. Confirming the evidence of Dio above, this shows not just magistrates like *stratego*i and the *grammateus* of the *demos* in action, but also individual members of the civic elite participating in the genesis of honorific decrees. Furthermore, I think it unlikely that the two collectives, the people of the agora and of the *plateia* (and possibly, whoever was responsible for erecting IvE 672A, if it was a collective), directly proposed honours for him in the *boule* since it is

²⁶ Heberdey, *Skizzenbuch* 98 (= IvE 672B) and *Skizzenbuch* 107 (= IvE 1913).

²⁷ However, one cannot assume that the actions of the *boule* and the *demos* lie behind every honorific inscription. In some cases it seems quite clear that individuals honour others through private initiatives, as personal friends and/or benefactors. In such cases there is no reason to posit the actions of the *boule* and the *demos*. See for example IvE 620.

²⁸ Dion. Chrys. 44.5.

²⁹ Mitchell suggests that individuals other than magistrates rarely initiated political action, see S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor* I, Oxford 1991, 201.

difficult to imagine how they were organized to approach this assembly. Elsewhere I have argued that the nature of these collectives was informal and occasional³⁰. They would more likely have chosen a representative to the *boule* on their behalf, if they were the originators of the idea to honour him. Next, the proposal was presented to the demos for approval, and the resulting decree was headed by the words: ἔδοξεν τῆς πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ δις νεοκόρου τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ φιλοσεβάστου Ἐφεσίων πόλεως τῇ βουλῇ καὶ δημοῖ³¹. Recorded on a perishable medium, the decree was then stored in the city's archive³². The next step in the genesis of these two inscriptions was their commissioning by each collective.

The genesis of epigraphic monuments

Jean Mallon posited a logical three-step process for the genesis of an inscription³³.

- 1) the drafting of the text of the inscription in cursive script.
- 2) the *ordinatio*, or transfer of the draft text in a non-permanent medium onto the stone in majuscule letters.
- 3) the carving of the text on the stone.

However, as Giancarlo Susini countered, the logical sequence may not have always been the historical sequence³⁴. For instance, let us take step one of the process, the drafting of the text. This stage is often not possible to document for any particular inscription, and seems rather to be a matter of logical deduction based on the type of inscription and its contents. The first question that arises in my mind is, who composed the draft? In the case of a simple funerary text, the commissioner, probably a relative of the deceased, might approach the epigraphic workshop with the personal details of the deceased and leave it to the stonecutters to put the data into a suitable formulae³⁵, or he may even have written the draft of the text himself³⁶. But what about IvE 672 and 3080? The fact that two collectives erected inscriptions so similar in language to one another suggests that they may have cooperated in the commissioning the texts. It seems logical to propose that, unless private individuals were taking their own minutes of assembly meetings, the two collectives had to address themselves to the city's archive to acquire a copy of the decree³⁷, and it is on this document that IvE 672 and 3080 were based. Furthermore, I suggest that the same individual drafted the texts of both inscriptions. The overall similarities in language and content make this evident. A small detail of vocabulary I think clinches this argument. Consider for example the following two phrases. The first one makes up

³⁰ Kalinowski (n. 7).

³¹ Taken from IvE 24B II. 1–4.

³² McLean, *Greek Epigraphy* 9.

³³ Mallon, *Paléographie des papyrus d'Égypte* (n. 4) 141–60.

³⁴ Susini, *Roman Stonecutter* 42.

³⁵ Susini believes that this was extremely common, especially in the case of funerary texts, see *Roman Stonecutter* 46.

³⁶ S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor* II, Oxford 1993, 105.

³⁷ Public bodies recorded detailed minutes on papyrus or whitened boards and deposited them in the public archives, see McLean, *Greek Epigraphy* 9.

the first 3 1/2 lines of IvE 3080: Τ. Φλ. Δαμιανού | τὸν ἴδιον εὐεργέτην καὶ | ἐν πᾶσιν ἀσύγκριτον ἢ | πλατεῖα. The second makes up the last 4 lines of 672: ἀναστησάντων τὴν τειμὴν | παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ | ἀνδρὸς τοῦ κατὰ πάντα | ἀσύγκριτου. In both cases we are dealing with expressions identifying who put up the inscription. In both cases we also have an additional reference to the benefactor, that he is 'incomparable', expressed with the adjective ἀσύγκριτος. Furthermore, in each case the word ἀσύγκριτος is used in phrases that express Damianus' incomparability in all respects: on the one hand, ἐν πᾶσιν ἀσύγκριτον, and on the other, κατὰ πάντα | ἀσύγκριτου. It may well be that ἀσύγκριτος was used to describe Damianus in the original decree of the *boule* and *demos*. The person who drafted IvE 672 and 3080 made some effort to retain in each what he saw as an essential part of the description of the benefactor.

Was it the personnel of the archive who did the work of drafting the texts inscribed on IvE 672 and 3080? We do not know enough about the day to day functioning of civic archives to answer this question. However, the involvement of archive personnel in the drafting of some epigraphic texts must be a given, since at least some civic decrees were inscribed. Or should we imagine that a copy of the decree honouring Damianus was handed to the stonecutters' workshop, along with the names of the collectives who were commissioning the inscriptions, and one of the personnel there saw to the addition of correct formulae and the drafting of each text, and its layout and carving³⁸? Or, do we need to posit a person connected neither with the archive nor with the stonecutters' workshop who did the work of composing the texts? G. Licinius Ateimetos Aurelianus, *neopoios* of Artemis and *grammateus* of Asia of the temples in Ephesos, is mentioned only in IvE 3080 as the *epimeletes* of the erection of the monument (ἐπιμεληθέντος τῆς ἀναστίσεως τῆς τειμῆς, ll. 21–22). Was Ateimetos appointed by the people of the *plateia* to draft the text, to bring it to the *officina*, to see to the accurate completion of the monument, and its erection? Bradley McLean sees the *epimeletes*, at least for public inscriptions, as the person appointed to review the inscription on its completion, and further suggests that the *epimeletes* might have a special interest in the text, as the person who proposed the legislation, or as a relative of a person honored³⁹. If Ateimetos did have a special interest in the honoring of Damianus, then it is odd that he is not named on IvE 672. The idea that he was appointed to check over the text and approve the erection of IvE 3080 upon its completion has some attraction initially, since this monument provided certain challenges that the stonecutter had to overcome, as we shall see below. However, a spelling error in IvE 3080 that specifically concerns Ateimetos' offices makes it unlikely that he drafted the text or even that he checked the complete monument for accuracy⁴⁰. Whoever drafted the texts, the personnel of the stonecutters' workshop had the freedom to make some alterations to make texts fit the medium of particular stones.

³⁸ On the existence of manuals with formulae and expressions and their use by stonecutters see R. Cagnat, *Sur les manuels de graveurs d'inscriptions romaines*, RPhil 13 (1889) 51–65.

³⁹ McLean, *Greek Epigraphy* 17–18.

⁴⁰ See below, p. 73–74.

The stones and the stonecutter's art

The discussion of step one, the drafting of the text, in the three-part creation of the epigraphic monument has revealed to us no firm answers. Although I suggest that one person composed the texts of both IvE 672 and 3080, it is not possible to specify who this may have been. We face similar problems in dealing with step two, the *ordinatio* or transfer of the text to the stone in a non-permanent medium, and with step three, the carving of the text onto the stone. Theoretically, *ordinatio* was the stage at which the cursive text was transferred to the stone in majuscule in a non-permanent medium, such as chalk⁴¹. The person who did the *ordinatio*, the *ordinator* or the *scriptor*, at this stage also saw to the pleasing arrangement of the text on the stone. It is not clear that *ordinatio* occurred in the genesis of every inscription, although Susini has suggested that in 90% of inscriptions this step was followed⁴². To determine whether or not *ordinatio* took place, it is necessary to consider, first, the type of inscription, and second, any features on the stone itself that provide evidence for or against the practice. For Attic decrees, Stephen Tracy has suggested that there was no *ordinatio* because it was uneconomical in the production of very long texts. On the other hand, a building inscription with large letters, running along an architrave, might well call for *ordinatio*, since pleasing arrangement was key to the overall aesthetic, and any error in spelling or arrangement would be glaring⁴³. Features of the stone, such as the presence of guidelines or marks, may demonstrate that some organization of the text prior to carving did take place⁴⁴. Whereas errors in the inscribed text, a feature found by Tracy on the Attic decrees, and poor spacing of the text on the stone, would seem to indicate that *ordinatio* did not take place. Another question that arises is, who did the work? Was the *ordinator* a different person from the cutter who carved the text? Again, few generalizations can be made⁴⁵, and this is difficult to determine in most cases. However, for some inscriptions from Ephesos, such as a copy of the decree of Paullus Fabius Persicus located in the Tetragnon agora (IvE 1a 18), Christa Mayer has proved the work of one *ordinator* (although she prefers the term *scriptor*), and five stonecutters⁴⁶. In the case of the parallel texts, IvE 672 and especially 3080, I think that it is possible to detect a very close collaboration between the *ordinator* and the cutter; in fact, they may be one and the same person. Hence, in much of what follows I will use the term stonecutter to refer to the person who organised the text and who also was ultimately responsible for its engraving.

⁴¹ Mallon insisted that *ordinatio* was a necessary step in the production of all inscriptions, Mallon, *Paléographie des papyrus d'Égypte* (n. 4) 141–160.

⁴² Susini, *Roman Stonecutter* 32.

⁴³ Tracy, (n. 4) 115, Gordon and Gordon, (n. 4) 70 and *passim*.

⁴⁴ It is not clear whether the laying down of guidelines was a part of the *ordinatio* because in some cases it is clear that the guidelines were made before the *ordinatio*. See McLean, *Greek Epigraphy* 9.

⁴⁵ Susini states that a single artisan in a workshop might do many jobs, *Roman Stonecutter* 19.

⁴⁶ C. Mayer, *Schreiber und Steinmetz*, in: P. Scherrer, H. Taeuber, H. Thür (ed.), *Steine und Wege. Festschrift für Dieter Knibbe* (Sonderschriften Bd. 32), Vienna 1999, 107–110.

A close study of the physical nature of the parallel texts below permits us to suggest a number of points about the organization of the carving and the thought processes of the stonemason(s). First, I suggest that these inscriptions were carved in the same workshop. The strongest piece of evidence for this is not just the similarity in content of the texts, but rather, that the layout on the stones is so similar: after the first few lines, the thought units are fit into the same line units, and word divisions at the end of the lines show many parallels. This can only have been accomplished if both stones were being carved at the same time, or if — and I think this was more likely the case — IvE 672 was carved first and served as the model for the IvE 3080. Furthermore, the stonemason was limited by his medium, since the two stones differ in size and features which delimit the inscribed field. Again, because these two are parallel texts, we are able to trace the choices and minute alterations made to the texts by the stonemason in order to achieve his goal.

The choice of a suitable block for an inscription probably took place in the stonemason's yard. It may have been determined by the budget and tastes of the commissioner, but was also influenced by the stock of blocks available at any one time. Because honorific monuments employed a fairly standard general shape of stone for statue bases (usually rectangular, taller than wide), and since there likely was pressure to get an inscription carved so that the monument could be erected in timely fashion, while the honour was still fresh, it is unlikely that special ordering from quarries took place⁴⁷. Therefore, IvE 672 and 3080 which are of local stone and of shapes that are unremarkable, were likely chosen from the stock immediately available to the stonemason. I also think it likely in many cases that the blocks were already shaped at the quarry, that is, the upper and lower profiled moldings and recessed panels were already present when the stonemason was to do his job⁴⁸. The presence of at least partly pre-shaped marble pieces, from columns to sarcophagi, cippi and basins in numerous shipwrecks throughout the Mediterranean indicates that pre-fabrication was the norm⁴⁹. I think this would be even more so the case for the statue bases that formed part of honorific monuments, the vast majority of which were quite standardized in appearance.

On close observation, the two blocks chosen to receive the two parallel texts, IvE 672 and 3080 are quite different, and this influenced how the stonemason(s) proceeded with the carving. In fact, looking carefully at these two parallel texts allows us to consider how stonemasons overcame some of the problems posed by their media. Both IvE 672 and 3080 are rectangular bases made of local greyish white marble with bluish streaks (Plates 1 and 2). In both cases, the upper and lower moldings were chipped off when they were reused in wall building. IvE 672 is 1.22 m. high, 0.495 m. wide and 0.48 m. thick. IvE 3080 is significantly shorter, being only 0.95 m.

⁴⁷ McLean, *Greek Epigraphy* 5–7 discusses the quarrying and various uses of large squared-off blocks.

⁴⁸ McLean, *Greek Epigraphy* 7 on 'ready-made' funerary stelae.

⁴⁹ For e.g. see P. Pensabene, *A cargo of marble shipwrecked at Punta Scifo near Crotona (Italy)*, *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration* 7. 2 (1978) 105–118.

high, while in width and breadth (0.48 m. wide and approx. 0.45 m. thick), it is similar to IvE 672. Besides height, the most striking difference between the two stones is the recessed framed panel on IvE 3080. On honorific bases, these panels delimit the field on which the inscription is to be written. The presence of such a framed panel on IvE 3080 reduced the inscribed field to a mere 0.45 m. × 0.24 m., which is about half the size of the area available for inscribing the text on IvE 672 (0.95 m. × 0.48 m.). This influenced how the stonecutter(s) organized the work, and arranged and carved the two inscriptions.

I suggested above that IvE 672 was inscribed before IvE 3080. Working on IvE 672 allowed the stonecutter(s) to work out the spatial organization of the very similar texts first on the larger, more spacious stone. The number of lines required for the text was determined at this time⁵⁰. My close examination of the squeeze convinced me that the stonecutter did lay out guidelines on which to write each line of text: for the most part, the bottom horizontals of the letters follow a notional line⁵¹. The cutter also ensured that there was sufficient space between all the lines to allow for the calligraphic right upper strokes of *upsilon* and *kappa*, which always go well above the lines. Also, the distance between the lines of text varies only by a millimetre.

The next step was the *ordinatio* or the writing of the text onto the stone with a non-permanent medium. Was IvE 672 laid out, letter by letter, in chalk on the stone before the carving? Probably not. Although in general the letters are of fairly uniform size on each line, there is some evidence of crowding at the right hand side of the stone. In lines 9 and 15, the omicrons at the right hand side are supralineate and small. Although the stone is damaged at the right hand side, one can only imagine that in line 5 the cutter would have to crowd the final 4 letters, ΚΟΣΙ, likely making the *omicron* supralineate to fit the line. Susini has seen crowding of letters, and their decrease in size towards the right margin as a sign of very rough *ordinatio* rather than its complete absence⁵². Line 8 shows a problem different to crowding: the letters start small but just over halfway they increase in size to fill the line. Ligatured letters also seem to be space saving devices in some cases, as for example in lines 16 and 17, and also may indicate a rough or absent *ordinatio*. At other times, ligatured letters appear to be visual emphases of important words because the initial letter of the ligatured group, often a *tau*, is taller than the surrounding letters⁵³. In lines 21–22 the ligatured *taus* in τῆν τεμῆν may be taller than the surrounding letters for emphasis; this monument to Damianus is the reification of τεμή or honour.

⁵⁰ The *ordinator/scriptor* usually determined the number of lines by looking at the stone and the text; large public texts may be an exception because the graphic text may have been laid out during the drafting, Susini, *Roman Stonecutter* 33.

⁵¹ I was able to work with the squeezes in the Austrian Archaeological Institute in November 2005 and November 2006.

⁵² Susini, *Roman Stonecutter* 46.

⁵³ Examples like this where ligatures appear to be visual emphases make me wonder if the stonecutter, whom I think in this case was also the *ordinator*, was literate enough to make this choice.

Looking at this inscription today, as it stands in the closed inscriptions museum, with the red paint restored⁵⁴, the overall effect produced by the stonemason is satisfactory in terms of arrangement and aesthetics. Not all of the lines are cramped at the right hand side; the size of the letters on each line decreases towards the middle of the monument and then increases again for the last three lines, which name the people who put up the monument; the spacing between the lines is consistent, and the calligraphic *kappa*, *upsilon* and *chi* are used to pleasing effect.

After the stonemason had carved IvE 672, a similar but not identical text was to be transferred to a stone to create IvE 3080. Despite the fact that it was to be inscribed on a smaller stone with the recessed framed panel, IvE 3080 was made to follow the same general arrangement as IvE 672. First, the text of IvE 3080 was arranged on almost the same number of lines: IvE 672 has twenty four lines, while IvE 3080 has twenty five. Second, taking into consideration that IvE 672 has more information at the beginning while IvE 3080 has more information at the end, it is remarkable that, by line 6, the stones virtually record the same information, line by line. Although the lines do not necessarily break in the same words, the sense units and line groupings of the inscriptions are almost identical as the following table shows.

Table 1:
Similarities in layout and textual differences between IvE 672 and IvE 3080⁵⁵

IvE 672	IvE 3080
I. 1 Τ(ίτον) Φλάουιον Δαμιανόν	II. 1–4. Τ(ίτον) Φλ(άουιον) Δαμιανόν τὸν ἴδιον εὐεργέτην καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀσύγκριτον ἢ πλατεῖα
I. 2–7. γραμματεύσαντα ἐ[πι-] φανῶς καὶ μετρήσαν[τα] μυριάδας μεδίμων [εἶ-] <u>κοσι καὶ χειλίους δια[κοσί-]</u> <u>ους μηνσὶν δεκατρισὶν [ό-]</u> λοις	II. 4–7 γραμματεύσαντα ἐπιφανῶς καὶ μετρήσαντα μυριάδας μεδίμων <u>κ' καὶ</u> <u>,ασ' μηνσὶν γ' ὅλοις</u>
II. 7–10 καὶ ὑποδεξάμενο[ν ἐν] τούτοις στρατόπεδα <u>τὰ ἀπὸ τ[ῆς]</u> <u>κατὰ Πάρθων νείκης ὑποστ[ρέ-]</u> <u>φοντα</u>	II. 7–10 καὶ ὑπο- δεξάμενον ἐν τούτοις στρα- τόπεδα ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Πάρθων νείκης ὑποστρέφοντα,

⁵⁴ The red paint which currently highlights the inscribed letters was restored in 1982 in order to make the texts legible in the rather dark gallery (Dieter Knibbe, pers. comm. 30 August 2006).

⁵⁵ The underlined sections indicate where the texts relate the same material in a different way.

IvE 672	IvE 3080
II. 10–12 καὶ πανηγυριαρχήσ[αν-] τα κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν μεγάλων [Ἐ-] φεσίων ἐκτενωῶς	II. 10–13 καὶ πανηγυριαρχήσαντα κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν μεγάλων Ἐφεσίων ἐκτενωῶς
II. 12–16 καὶ ἔργον ὑπ[ο-] σχόμενον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτῷ οἰ- κον ἐν τῷ <u>Οὐαρίου</u> βαλανείῳ μ[ε-] τὰ οἰκοδομῆς καὶ παντὸς κόσ- μου,	II. 13–16 καὶ ἔργον ὑποσχό- μενον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτῷ οἰ- κον ἐν τῷ <u>Οὐαρίῳ</u> βαλανείῳ μετὰ οἰκοδομῆς καὶ παντὸς κόσμου,
II. 16–20 καὶ μυριάδας ποιήσαντα <u>περισσὰς</u> ἐκ τῶν προσόδων τῆς ἰδίας γραμματείας τῇ πόλει <u>δεκαδύο καὶ ἑπτακισχίλια ὀ-</u> <u>κτακόσια δεκαῆξ</u>	II. 16–20 καὶ μυριάδας ποιή- σαντα <u>περισσείας</u> ἐκ τῶν προσόδων τῆς ἰδίας γραμ- ματείας τῇ πόλει <u>ιβ' ,ζωις'</u>
II. 21–24 ἀναστησάντων τὴν τειμὴν παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀνδρὸς τοῦ κατὰ πάντα ἀσυνκρίτου	II. 21–25 ἐπιμεληθέντος τῆς ἀνασ- τάσεως τῆς τειμῆς Γ(αίου) Λικινίου Ἀτειμήτου Αὐρηλιανοῦ νο- ποιοῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ γραμμα- τέως τῆς Ἀσίας ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ

Lines 2–7 (IvE 672)/4–7 (IvE 3080) discuss Damianus' provision of grain; lines 7–10/7–10, his hosting of the troops returning from the Parthian war; lines 10–12/10–13, his *panegyriarchy*; lines 12–16/13–16, his promise to build and decorate a hall in the baths of Varius; lines 16–20/16–20, his transfer of revenue to the city. Lines 21–24/21–25 provide information about who set up the honour. Lines 12–16 of IvE 672 and lines 13–16 of IvE 3080 almost follow exactly the same line endings. In another attempt to follow sense units of IvE 672, the stone cutter of IvE 3080 squeezes lines 8 and 9 but when he gets to line 10 he realises that he will have plenty of room to complete the sense unit on the line, and so gives each letter more space.

In order to follow the same principles of arrangement (line number and sense unit) on the smaller stone of IvE 3080, the cutter had to do a number of things. First and most obviously, he decreased the letter size. On IvE 672 the letters range between 2.9 cm and 1.8 cm, while on IvE 3080 the letters after line 2 range between 1.5–1.0 cm in height. The oversized letters of line 1, naming T. Flavius Damianus, are exceptional. It seems that the stonecutter chose to write these outside the recessed panel, on its frame, as a way to add dignity to an inscription of which the rest of the text was really very small. In doing so, he emphasized the name of the man honored.

IvE 3080 also shows evidence of the squeezing of letters towards the right. In line 8, the *sigmas* of τοῦτοις στρατόπεδα have no space between them, and the *tau* of

στρατόπεδα is very tall and ligatured to the *rho*. In line 9 the *-θων* of *-Πάρθων* is squeezed, causing the *omega* to be elliptical rather than round. At line 21, the stonecutter runs out of room to complete *Λικινίου* so the final *upsilon* of the word is carved outside the recessed panel on the frame, while the preceding *omicron* is very small and floats in the middle of its line. The squeezing is most evident in the last two lines of the inscription, which lie outside the recessed panel, and even stretch beyond the width of the panel above. This squeezing is evidence of either a complete lack of *ordinatio*, or at least of its limited use. Overall, there was less pre-arrangement of the text on IvE 3080 than on IvE 672. Another proof of this appears upon very close examination of the inscription and of the squeeze. The writing of IvE 3080 appears to be quite freehand: the tops and bottoms of letters do not follow horizontals (for e.g. lines 4, 6), nor are vertical *hastae* always vertical. In some cases the *hastae* of letters with two verticals are of different lengths, as for example the *eta* in *Ἐφεσθή-* in line 12, and the *pi* in *ὑποσχο-* in line 13. If the stonecutter was the same person who carved IvE 672, he was being particularly careless in IvE 3080, perhaps bored with carving virtually the same text twice and having to do it on a less suitable stone. It may also be that the stonecutter of IvE 3080 was not the same, but a junior, less experienced member of the *officina*. The virtually free-hand style of carving noted above reinforces this point. The hand also shows some differences of which the most immediately evident is the *upsilon*. In IvE 672 the upper right stroke of the *upsilon* is calligraphic, usually extending up and over the next letter to the right. In IvE 3080, there is only one truly calligraphic *upsilon* in line 4; the remainder are plain. This is notable especially because calligraphic *kappas* and *chis* occur in both texts.

Another technique that the stonecutter used to keep to the line and sense units set out by IvE 672 was abbreviation. Whereas in IvE 672 the cutter wrote out in words the amount of grain provided over the number of months (ll. 4–6), and the number of denarii given to the city by Damianus (ll. 19–20), the cutter of IvE 3080 used alphabetic abbreviations for both (ll. 5–6 and l. 20). Thus, *μυριάδας μεδίωνων [εἴ]κοσι καὶ χειλίους δια[κοσι]λους μηνὶν δεκατρισὶν [δ]ίλοις*, which takes up three and a half lines of text, is reduced to its alphabetic expression *μερίδιμων κ' καὶ | ,ασ' μηνὶν γ' ὄλοις*, which takes up one and half lines of text. The same is true of the expression concerning the money that Damianus contributed to the city. In IvE 672 *δεκαδύο καὶ ἑπτακισχίλια ὀκτακόσια δεκαεξί* is reduced to *ιβ' ,ζωις'* in IvE 3080.

Missing words, different words

Differences between the texts of IvE 672 and IvE 3080 are indicated by underlining in Table 1 above, and deserve reflection because they allow us insight into the thoughts of the stonecutter(s), or his lack of thought. In lines 7–10 of IvE 3080 the definite article *τὰ* that in 672 stands between *στρατόπεδα* and *ἀπὸ τ[ῆς] | κατὰ Πάρθων νεύκης* is missing. Is this an error that has been introduced into the text by the stonecutter, due to a lack of attention to IvE 672 and lack of grammatical knowledge, or did he intentionally choose to skip this word because it was possible to do so without entirely losing the sense of the thought unit? There are two arguments which support the latter view point, that the cutter skipped the word intentionally. First, the

τὰ in IvE 672 is hard to miss: it is one of the few examples of the letter *tau* which is tall but not ligatured (ligatured *taus* are usually tall). If the cutter of IvE 3080 was following IvE 672 closely it would be hard to miss the word. Second, the missing τὰ was to have stood in one of the most crowded lines of the entire text of IvE 3080, so it may be that the cutter was trying to save space. On the other hand, his literacy in knowing which word to omit while keeping the sense of the phrase, is countered by his lack of skill as a stonecutter, since as the well spaced line 10 proves, there was no need to crowd lines 8 and 9 in order to keep the sense unit structure.

Another interesting difference between the IvE 672 and IvE 3080 is their respective expressions regarding the building that Damianus promised to undertake in the Varius Baths. In IvE 672 (ll. 13–14) the expression is οἶκον ἐν τῷ Οὐαρίῳ βαλανείῳ, while in IvE 3080 the expression is οἶκον ἐν τῷ Οὐαρίῳ βαλανείῳ (ll. 14–15). Here the argument of space saving probably ought not to come into play since replacing *omicron* and *upsilon* with *omega*, the latter being a wide letter, seems not very sensible especially since line 15 is not particularly crowded. I think that we should perhaps see a stonecutters ‘error’ here, if error means divergence from an original decree which IvE 672 may have reflected more closely. However, this does not corrupt the meaning of the statement in a significant way: instead of ‘baths of Varius’ in IvE 672, we read something akin to ‘Varian baths’. Indeed, both expressions may reflect two ways in which contemporary Ephesians referred to this bath complex.

However, a real error does occur in line 23–24 of IvE 3080, where the cutter wrote νοποιοῦ instead of νεοποιοῦ in the description of the offices of G. Licinius Ateimetos Aurelianos. So unexpected and unusual is this error that the editors of *Inscripfen von Ephesos* wrongly print the word with an *epsilon*, even though it does not appear on the stone. Jean Mallon in his writings on the genesis of inscriptions was convinced that such errors on inscriptions occurred during the *ordinatio* process, due to misreading of the cursive draft as it was being transferred in a non-permanent medium to the stone⁵⁶. I have suggested above that given the ‘freehand’ rendering of IvE 3080 and the evidence of squeezing, that there was likely no letter by letter *ordinatio* of this text. Instead, the cutter was concerned to keep to the line and sense units set out by IvE 672. Another explanation may be that the *draft* contained this error and the cutter who was working directly from the draft simply copied it. (Recall that in this part of the text the cutter could not use IvE 672 as a check). If this was the case, it is likely that Ateimetos was not the drafter of the text, since presumably he would not have spelled incorrectly one of his own offices! This error may also imply a certain level of illiteracy on the part of the cutter. But I am not convinced that this was the case, especially if we look at the choices made in the spelling of a particular word in lines 17 and 18 of both texts.

Line 17 of IvE 672 reads: περισσὰς ἐκ τῶν προσόδων, while in IvE 3080 line 18 reads: περισσείας ἐκ τῶν προσόδων. In other words we get a different spelling of the word περισσὰς — περισσείας. The standard spelling is the longer one⁵⁷ that is used

⁵⁶ Mallon, *Pierres faufives* (n. 4) 187–199; 435–459.

⁵⁷ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1949, 1387.

in IvE 3080, the inscription that is squeezed onto the smaller stone with the recessed panel. Above we have noted space saving devices used by the stonecutter (smaller letters, abbreviations, omission of words). A close examination of the stone shows that here the stonecutter used the longer form of the word, with two extra letters $\epsilon\iota$ to fill up a line that would otherwise have too few letters for the space. The opposite is true in IvE 672, where if the stone cutter had used the form with the two extra letters $\epsilon\iota$, the result would have been a line that would have been very crowded indeed. By choosing different spellings the cutter(s) in each case made a good choice given the constraints of their media.

Conclusions

The parallel texts IvE 672 and 3080 provide scholars with an opportunity not only to reflect on the brilliance, wealth and (self-)importance of the Ephesian sophist T. Flavius Damianus, but permit reflection on the process of creation of two almost identical inscriptions. The genesis of an epigraphic monument was a flexible process that did not always follow the theoretical three-step model: draft – *ordinatio* – carving. It was highly dependent on who the commissioner of a monument was, and on personnel of the *officina* which was to create it. I have suggested that the parallel texts of these honorific monuments stemmed from the same decree of the *boule* and the *demos* of Ephesos. The two groups who commissioned the monuments, the people of the agora and the people of the *plateia* appear to have cooperated with one another in the erection of the monuments, and likely, the same person authored both texts, although it is impossible to identify this individual. A close study of the parallel texts shows that their genesis was coordinated: they have matching sense and line units, and we can see the strategies of the stonecutter in fitting IvE 3080 onto a stone much smaller than IvE 672. Through studying closely their forms, these two inscriptions allow us to tell a story of their genesis, and show that the history of epigraphic texts goes far beyond their contents.

University of Saskatchewan
Department of History
9 Campus Drive
Saskatoon S7N 5A5
Canada
hist.dept@usask.ca

Angela Kalinowski



zu Kalinowski, S. 53ff. (IvE 672)



zu Kalinowski, S. 53ff. (IvE 3080)