

I. Introduction

Between the first and fifth centuries AD, thousands of ordinary inhabitants of the cities and villages of the eastern Roman empire composed or commissioned Greek verse epigrams in memory of their deceased parents, spouses and children. This vast corpus of «popular» verse, with its own distinctive generic conventions, is an exceptionally rich source for the ethical values and assumptions of ordinary provincials. Funerary poetry is also an important category of evidence for the character and quality of literary education in the Roman East. The vocabulary used by Greek epitaph-writers, their metrical competence (or lack of it), and the range and sophistication of literary allusion can all tell us an enormous amount about levels of education and literacy in East Roman urban and rural society during the imperial and late imperial periods.¹

This formidable body of «sub-literary» verse has seldom been subjected to serious sociological study.² But the funerary poetry of the Roman East has been

* Abbreviations follow those used in SEG, with the following additions: BRIXHE, *Essai* = CL. BRIXHE, *Essai sur le grec anatolien au début de notre ère, nouvelle édition augmentée*, 1987; I.Konya = B. H. MCLEAN, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Konya Archaeological Museum*, 2002; KILyk = G. LAMINGER-PASCHER, *Die kaiserzeitlichen Inschriften Lykaoniens I*, 1992; LfgrE = *Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos*, 4 vols., 1955-2010; SGO I-V = R. MERKELBACH and J. STAUBER, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, 5 vols., 1998-2004; WILHELM, *Grabinschriften* = A. WILHELM, *Griechische Grabinschriften aus Kleinasien*, SBBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 27, 1932, 792-865, reprinted in *Akademieschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, 1974, II 336-409. I am indebted to CHRISTOF SCHULER, ANDREAS VICTOR WALSER, and an anonymous referee for comments and criticism.

¹ The bibliography on Roman literacy and literate education is enormous: see especially W. HARRIS, *Ancient Literacy*, 1989; T. MORGAN, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, 1998. For late antiquity, see R. A. KASTER, *Guardians of Language*, 1988, and on Greek poetry in particular, G. AGOSTI, in *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, 2012, 361-404.

² Notable exceptions include L. ROBERT, *Hellenica IV*, 1948 (late antique epigrams); A. SARTRE-FAURIAT, *Syria* 75, 1998, 213-24 (verse epitaphs of the Hauran); G. AGOSTI, *Antiquité Tardive* 18,

rendered vastly more accessible in recent years, thanks to the publication of R. MERKELBACH and J. STAUBER's *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten* (five volumes, 1998–2004).³ This splendid compilation, covering the verse epigraphy of Asia Minor, Syria, the Levant, and the East, enables us for the first time to map regional variants in the local poetry of the eastern Roman empire with relative ease. Despite occasional disagreements on points of detail, my debt to MERKELBACH and STAUBER will be abundantly clear from every page of this paper.

This paper will focus on a group of verse epitaphs from one small region of central Anatolia, namely the southern part of the «Axylon», the dry East Phrygian steppe to the west of Lake Tatta (modern Tuz Gölü) in the Roman province of Galatia (Map 1).⁴ This region has produced a very large quantity of funerary verse (more than seventy epitaphs), most of which appears to date to the fourth and fifth centuries AD.⁵ What gives this body of texts its particular interest is the absence of any major ancient urban centres anywhere in the East Phrygian steppe. Throughout the early Roman imperial period, the greater part of the steppe was administered and exploited through a network of large imperial and private estates. Aside from the small towns of Laodikeia Katakekaumene and Perta on the southern fringe of the Axylon, this was almost entirely a land of villages. The Roman and late Roman verse epitaphs of the Axylon therefore offer

2010, 163-80, with copious bibliography; recent monographs (with a rather different focus from this paper) include V. GARULLI, *Byblos Lainee: Epigrafia, letteratura, epitafio*, 2012, and M. OBRYS, *Unsterblichkeitsglaube in den griechischen Versinschriften*, 2012. For the verse epigraphy of inner Anatolia, the single most important study remains WILHELM, *Grabinschriften*; a valuable overview of Lykaonian verse epitaphs is provided in C. BREYTENBACH and C. ZIMMERMANN, *Early Christianity in Lycaonia* (forthcoming). I am grateful to Dr. ZIMMERMANN for sharing her work with me in advance of publication.

³ Here cited in the form «SGO I–V 00/00/00».

⁴ H. WENZEL, *Forschungen in Inneranatolien II: Die Steppe als Lebensraum*, 1937; S. MITCHELL, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, 1993, I 143-58; MAMA XI, pp. xxiv-xxix.

⁵ MERKELBACH and STAUBER include no fewer than 68 verse inscriptions from Laodikeia Katakekaumene and the steppe to the north (SGO III 14/01–14/06, 16/45; SGO V 24/19–24/20). Their selection is not comprehensive: add e.g. MAMA I 228, Sarayönü; MAMA I 229-30, Kadınhanı; MAMA I 233, Dedeler; MAMA I 299, Atlanti; MAMA VII 229, Turgut.

us a rare and precious sample of ancient «village poetry». With the single exception of the upper Tembris valley in northern Phrygia, I know of no other rural part of the eastern Roman empire which has produced anything like this quantity of verse epigraphy.⁶

Most probably, the verse epitaphs of the Axylon were largely the work of village schoolmasters, a class about which we know frustratingly little. Large cities in Asia Minor certainly had several professional γραμματικοί, teachers of Greek language and (usually) poetry; the town of Thyateira in Lydia even had a teacher of Latin (γραμματικός Ῥωμαϊκός).⁷ Rural schoolmasters are less commonly attested, but as late as the mid-sixth century AD an eight-year old boy at the little Galatian village of Sykeon could expect to be sent to a γραμματικός to learn his letters.⁸ There is some reason to think that at least some village teachers may have received their own education in large cities: a γραμματικός from Tarsos turns up in a remote part of the territory of Pontic Amaseia, and a Smyrnaian παιδοτρίβης (gymnastic trainer) is known from rural eastern Pisidia, between Amblada and Ouasada.⁹

⁶ MERKELBACH and STAUBER collect 42 verse texts from the upper Tembris valley (SGO III 16/31), the majority of which seem to date to the fourth century AD.

⁷ γραμματικοί: W. V. HARRIS, ZPE 52, 1983, 95-102; S. AGUSTA-BOULAROT, MEFRA 106/2, 1994, 653-746; C. LAES, *Children in the Roman Empire*, 2011, 107-37; see also CHR. MAREK, *Pontus et Bithynia*, 2003, 149. Latin teacher at Thyateira: TAM V 2, 1119; R. KEARSLEY, *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia*, 2001, no. 91.

⁸ A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Vie de Théodore de Sykeôn*, 1970, Ch. 5: ὁκταετῇ δὲ γενόμενον αὐτὸν δέδωκε διδασκάλῳ μαθεῖν γράμματα. Several διδάσκαλοι in early Christian inscriptions are probably presbyters, not schoolmasters: thus KILyK 47 (Losta); SGO III 16/31/93 (Altıntaş), A verse 3 (where read τὸν σοφίης ἐμὲ διδάσκαλ[ον] | κὲ νόμον, «me, teacher of wisdom and laws»: BE 2002, 342, p. 701).

⁹ Tarsian γραμματικός: S. AGUSTA-BOULAROT, MEFRA 106/2, 1994, 702-3, no. 45. Smyrnaian παιδοτρίβης: J. R. S. STERRETT, *The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, 1888, 181, no. 297 (Akçalar). For other examples of «educational mobility», cf. e.g. CIL II 2892 (AE 1987, 617: a *grammaticus* from Clunia in Tarraconensis, resident at Tritium Magallum); I.Byzantion 120 (a γραμματικός from Bithynion-Klaudioupolis, resident at Byzantion).

One cardinal fact about the funerary verse of the Axylon should be highlighted at the outset. Every one of the fifteen epitaphs discussed in this paper represents an attempt to imitate, as closely as possible, the diction and vocabulary of the Homeric epics, their μουσικὰ ἔπεα, as an epitaph from Ikonion puts it.¹⁰ As we will see, virtually every line of every epitaph contains a quotation, a half-quotation, or a pastiche of something from the Iliad or Odyssey.¹¹ That the farmers and shepherds of fifth-century AD inner Anatolia chose to commemorate their dead in the idiom of eighth-century BC Ionian epic poetry is, of course, a quite extraordinary cultural phenomenon in its own right, as if the cattle-farmers of modern Tennessee were to compose their tombstones in the language and style of Beowulf.

No less striking is the complete absence of other «literary» influences on the verse epitaphs of rural inner Anatolia. In the cities and larger towns of western Asia Minor, other Archaic and Classical Greek poets, particularly Hesiod and Menander, continued to be widely read into the later Roman imperial period. In a recently published verse inscription from Bithynian Nikomedeia, perhaps of the fourth century AD, the deceased is described as «emulator of Hesiod, rival of Archilochos, near to the eloquence of Menander and Xenophon»; at Sobagena, in eastern Cappadocia, a talented local poet may even have read some Callimachus.¹² There is no sign of such broad literary knowledge in the little rural communities of the late antique Axylon.

¹⁰ H. S. CRONIN, JHS 22, 1902, p. 349, no. 89 (Konya: not in SGO), μουσικοῖς ἐπέεσσι[ν ... τ]οὺς γονέας τεῖσαν; cf. the Ὀμηρίοις ἐπέεσσιν of SGO III 16/41/09 (Yapıldak: apparently an oracle-monger).

¹¹ Including several Homeric «tags» which were popular across the entire Roman East, such as τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων (No. 15), found in dozens of verse epitaphs from Anatolia and beyond (a few examples collected by MERKELBACH and STAUBER, SGO III 13/07/02). The «mobility» of verses is a notable feature of East Roman funerary poetry: for a particularly striking example, see T. DREW-BEAR, in *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies presented to B. M. W. Knox*, eds. G. BOWERSOCK *et al.*, 1979, 308-16.

¹² Nikomedeia: C. P. JONES, *Epigraphica X-XII*, ZPE 188, 2014, 31-3. Callimachus at Sobagena: SGO III 13/04/01, with the rare words ἀστυφέλικτος, ἐδέθλιον, both of which are, however, also found

The village γραμματικοί of central Anatolia clearly knew their Iliad and Odyssey extremely well. The verse epitaphs of the region include a remarkable variety of rare Homeric words and apposite phrases. Nonetheless, these Anatolian villagers' evident love of Homer makes a poignant contrast with their helplessness in the face of difficult Homeric vocabulary and morphology, and their versification, whether in hexameters or elegiacs, is hit and miss at best. A telling example of what could be expected from an inner Anatolian schoolmaster (even in a large and prosperous town) derives from Kappadokian Tyana, where a teacher (παιδευτής) by the name of Sarapion erected a small funerary *stēlē* for himself, with an elegantly inscribed verse distich recording how he «educated the learned among the Tyanians in the works of the Muses». Yet Sarapion was unable to produce an accurate elegiac couplet: the hexameter contains a bad metrical blunder.¹³

For a particularly striking instance of wide Homeric reading coupled with technical maladroitness, we may turn to a funerary epigram copied at the modern town of Kırşehir in northern Kappadokia.¹⁴

1-3	ν.1	ἦ ῥά τι καὶ νεκύεσιν ἐπαυρέμεν ἦνδανε κάλλους·
3-5	ν.2	Ἀνατόλιν ὅτι τάχος ἔδρα μεν εἰς Ἀείδα.
5-9	ν.3	ἔλι να δ' ἐν θαλάμοι[ς] πατήρ φίλος Ἑλπί διος ἡ δέ νυν μή τηρ Ἀντιπάτρα
9-12	ν.4	ῥ μοξαν ἐρατοῦ πε δὸς ἀποφθιμέ νου.

in late Greek «literary» verse (Nonnus, Greg. Naz., etc.). Note also the elegant and ingenious funerary epigram of a γραμματικός at Pontic Sebastopolis: SGO II 11/13/01.

¹³ D. BERGES and J. NOLLÉ, Tyana I, 230-2 no. 57 (SGO III 13/07/05), παιδευτῶν ὅχ' ἄριστος Σεραπίων ἐνθάδε κεῖμαι, / παιδεύσας Μούσαις τοὺς Τυανῶν λογίους. The opening phrase imitates Il. 7.221, where the leather-worker Tychios is described as σκυτοτόμων ὅχ' ἄριστος. This phrase was often imitated by artisans in the imperial Greek world: see e.g. SGO IV 22/38/01 (Bosana, Syria), οἰκοδόμων ὅχ' ἄριστος; SEG 41, 1033 (Thyateira), σκυτοτόμων ὅχ' ἄριστος Ἀπολλωνίδης ἐνθάδε κεῖμαι.

¹⁴ T. PREGER, in R. OBERHUMMER and H. ZIMMERER, *Durch Syrien und Kleinasien*, 1899, p. 306, no. 6 (SGO III 13/08/01).

«Indeed it was pleasing even to the dead to have a touch of beauty; (for) Anatolis ran down swiftly to Hades. In their unmarried son's bedchamber, his dear father Elpidios and his mother Antipatra grievously bewailed their lovely deceased child.»

From one perspective, this little epigram shows a superb knowledge of the Homeric epics. Virtually every phrase in the text has Homeric authority, from the opening particle combination ἦ ῥά τι (Il. 2.238) to the concluding πεδὸς ἀποφθιμένου (Il. 18.89, παιδὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο; 18.499, ἀνδρὸς ἀποφθιμένου). The second couplet is a reworking of one of Homer's most famous and vivid depictions of parental grief, the scene in which Hektor's parents watch their son's body being dragged behind Achilles' chariot (Il. 22.405-9); the author of the epigram has attached the end of Il. 22.405 (ἦ δέ νυ μήτηρ) to an adapted version of the first part of Il. 22.408 (ῥῶμωξεν δ' ἐλεεινὰ πατὴρ φίλος).¹⁵

However, from a technical perspective, this is a less than impressive performance. The first half of the second verse (apparently intended as a pentameter) is hopelessly unmetrical, and the third verse has been mangled by the supermetrical insertion of two personal names into an otherwise respectable hexameter (αἴλινα δ' ἐν θαλάμοις πατὴρ φίλος, ἦ δέ νυ μήτηρ).¹⁶ Even this «original» hexameter includes a superfluous article (ἦ) and two inappropriate particles (δέ νυ) mechanically preserved from the Homeric original.

¹⁵ The author has altered ἐλεεινὰ to the non-Homeric (αἴ)λινα for metrical reasons, with ῥῶμωξεν displaced to the start of the pentameter. In line 8, where PREGER prints ἦδέ («and»), the Homeric parallel (Il. 22.405) guarantees the awkward ἦ δέ (inconstruable though the phrase is in this context). The unmetrical νυν for νυ in the same line may be the fault of the mason rather than the author.

¹⁶ For unmetrical personal names in verse epitaphs of the region, see the commentary to No. 6 below, verse 5. In line 6, PREGER (followed by MERKELBACH and STAUBER) prints θαλάμοι[ς], noting that there is insufficient space on the stone for θαλάμοι[σι]. If θαλάμοι[ς] is correct, we would have here a case of metrical lengthening after the caesura, very common in epitaphic verse of this period: see below, n.22.

Verses of this kind give us a vivid picture of the levels of literate education on offer in the small towns and villages of late Roman Anatolia. Subjecting each and every one of the thousands of extant Anatolian verse epitaphs to detailed analysis would be a Herculean task, with rapidly diminishing returns. Hence in this paper I have selected fifteen typical verse epitaphs from the Axylon for close study. Nine of these epitaphs can, in my view, be confidently attributed to three distinct village poets, whom I have named the «Zıvarık poet» (Section II, Nos. 1–4), the «Çeşmelisebil poet» (Section III, Nos. 5–7), and the «Koçaş poet» (Section IV, Nos. 10–11). Two further epitaphs from Çeşmelisebil (Section III, Nos. 8–9) share enough phraseology with Nos. 5–7 that I have tentatively attributed them, too, to the «Çeşmelisebil poet». A twelfth epitaph is written in such a distinctive and unusual style that I have named its author the «Zengen poet» (Section V, No. 12). Finally, I have also included three early Christian epitaphs written in what we might call the «Axylon verse *koinē*», a style of poetic diction found in dozens of epitaphs from the East Phrygian steppe, which cannot confidently be assigned to specific poets (Section VI, Nos. 13–15).

To the best of my knowledge, no-one has previously attempted to attribute groups of inner Anatolian verse epitaphs to single poets or «stylistic groups» in this way. Such attributions are, inevitably, a matter of judgement rather than proof. Nos. 10 and 11 derive from neighbouring villages, and appear to be the epitaphs of a brother and sister; both texts are three verses long; both make the same syntactical error in indicating the deceased's age; and the third verse of each text begins with a word for «sweet-voiced». In my judgement, sole authorship is the most economical explanation of these various data, but I am happy to acknowledge that the existence of a single «Koçaş poet» cannot strictly be demonstrated.¹⁷ The concept of the «stylistic group» – although widely used in the study of other aspects of Anatolian funerary monuments – is of course

¹⁷ Nos. 3 and 4 (the «Zıvarık poet») are inscribed in a very similar hand, on monuments of near-identical design and dimensions (n.21 below). As it happens, I only noticed this during the final stages of preparing this article, having earlier attributed the two texts to the same poet on purely stylistic grounds.

similarly subjective.¹⁸ Nos. 13–15 seem to me to resemble one another in language and diction more closely than they resemble any of the other epitaphs studied in this paper; they may all be the work of a single poet, or could equally be the work of several distinct contemporary poets who read and imitated one another's work. Other distinct «stylistic groups» in the funerary verse of inner Anatolia are not difficult to find, and would reward further attention.¹⁹

Certain readers may question the use of the term «poet» for the authors of these texts, as opposed to, for instance, «versifiers», «competent amateurs», «dilettantes», «skilled stonemasons», etc. Without doubt, the epitaphs studied in this paper contain several metrical and grammatical infelicities, and their subject matter is, to say the least, repetitive. But from the perspective of the social historian – as opposed to the literary critic – the distinction between (skilled, imaginative, aesthetically satisfying) poets and (incompetent, derivative, sentimental) versifiers is subjective, morally obnoxious, and practically unhelpful. All of the epigrams studied in this paper were, by definition, the work of poets; what we happen to think of the quality of their poetry is, it seems to me, of relatively minor historical interest.

I see no objective criteria for dating any of these texts with precision. The Aurelian *nomen* appears in Nos. 6 and 8, and perhaps in No. 5. I would tentatively suggest a date in the late third or early fourth century AD for the «Zıvarık poet», on the basis of the absence of any explicit Christian terminology. All of the other epitaphs studied here ought probably to be dated to the fourth or

¹⁸ For distinct regional «stylistic groups» of funerary stelai and doorstones in inner Anatolia, see e.g. M. WAELEKENS, *Die Kleinasiatischen Türsteine*, 1986; T. LOCHMAN, *Studien zu kaiserzeitlichen Grab- und Votivreliefs aus Phrygien*, 2003.

¹⁹ Note in particular the lengthy epitaphs MAMA X 77 and 89 (SGO III 16/31/90 and 16/31/80), both from Altıntaş. A single author was probably responsible for three epitaphs from the western fringe of the Axylon (SGO III 16/43/05 [Yeşilyayla], 16/43/97 [Kurtuşağı], and 16/45/09 [Turgut]); a series of verse epitaphs found at Zazadın Hanı, near Konya, are probably all the work of the same poet (SGO III 14/07/03, 14/07/05; SGO V 24/21; perhaps also H. S. CRONIN, *JHS* 22, 1902, 360 no. 121); and two epitaphs from Zengen can plausibly be attributed to a single writer (MAMA VII 582–3, SGO III 14/03/02–03).

fifth century AD.

II. The «Zıvarık poet» (Nos. 1–4)

Four inscriptions can be attributed with confidence to this poet, two of them from the modern village of Zıvarık (now Altınekin), the other two from the neighbouring villages of Keşlik Yaylası and Yeniyayla (8 and 10 km west of Zıvarık). A large number of Greek inscriptions have been recorded at Zıvarık (some 31 texts in total), suggesting the existence of an ancient village on the site, although no name can be assigned to it with confidence.²⁰

This poet is certainly the most technically competent, and probably the earliest in date, of the writers studied in this paper. His four epitaphs contain no explicitly Christian vocabulary, although the unobtrusive cross at the beginning of No. 1 – and perhaps the personal name Παῦλος in No. 3 – suggests that he was writing in at least a partially Christian milieu. Published photographs are available for three of the four monuments (Nos. 1, 3 and 4), all of which were beautifully inscribed in a fine cursive hand. Nos. 3 and 4 were inscribed on monuments of identical design and very similar dimensions, and may have been the work of the same mason.²¹

Metrically, these four epitaphs are of a respectable standard: I have noted only three serious metrical errors (No. 2, verse 7; No. 3, verses 3 and 7), excluding the treatment of personal names. Hiatus is relatively common, particularly at the caesura (No. 1, verse 1; No. 2, verse 3; No. 3, verse 4). There are two possible

²⁰ MAMA XI, p. xxix, with nn. 48-9. There is no good reason to assign Zıvarık to Laodikeia Katakekaumene (despite W. M. CALDER, MAMA I, p. xv; T. DREW-BEAR, *Gnomon* 59, 1987, 606), or to identify it with ancient Congusso/Kongoustos (MAMA VII, pp. xxiii-xxiv; K. BELKE, *TIB 4: Galatien und Lykaonien*, 1984, 153 s.v. Congusso).

²¹ Both monuments are large, plain limestone slabs, with the inscription in a simple *tabula ansata*. No. 3: Ht. 0.75; W. 1.10. No. 4: Ht. 0.74; W. 1.30. Note further that line-end and verse-end coincide throughout Nos. 2 and 4 (a rather unusual phenomenon in verse epitaphs of the region), while No. 1 indicates verse-ends with an interpunct «:»: cf. G. AGOSTI, *Antiquité Tardive* 18, 2010, 174-5.

cases of accent determining quantity in the final *metron* (No. 1, verse 6: πόσιν; No. 4, verse 4: ἀνοσ(ε)ίων). The poet's most striking variation from Homeric metrical practice is his regular lengthening of a short syllable after the penthemimeral caesura (seven times in 29 verses, i.e. around 25%). As we will see, this phenomenon is also found in several of the other texts studied in this paper (Nos. 5–6, 12–15), and seems to have been common in late Greek verse epigraphy; it is also often found in Sibylline oracular verse.²² Despite their overall quality, the poems do include a few notable misunderstandings of Homeric vocabulary and morphology: see notes on ἀριστῆον (No. 1, verse 6); perhaps κατεπᾶλτο (No. 2, verse 4); ἐξονομέντες (No. 4, verse 8).

1. Verse epitaph for Wenawia

Limestone block, broken at right. Inscription in plain recessed panel, continuing onto the lower moulding (lines 16-17). On the upper moulding, two peacocks facing one another; between them, arcade with rounded columns supporting two semicircular blind arches. On the left moulding, schematic vine-tendril pattern. **Fig. 1** (photograph).

Yeniyayla, in a house (W. M. CALDER, 1925).

Ht. 0.93; W. 0.59+; Th. 0.10–0.12; letters 0.012–0.020.

W. M. CALDER, MAMA I 234 (SGO III 14/06/22).

1-2	ν.1	† ἐνθ' ἄλοχος πινυτή [άν] δρὸς κρατεροῦ ὑπόκιτ[ε]·
3-5	ν.2	τοῦνομα Οὐεναυία π[ι] νυτόφρονος ἴδος ἔχ[ου] σα. :
5-6	ν.3	τῆς δ' ἦτυ χαρίεν [κὲ] ἐράσμιον ἦτο πρόσωπ[ον],
7-8	ν.4	ὄμματ(α) δ' ὥστε βοός, μιν[υν] θαδίη δ' ἐτελεύτα· :
8-10	ν.5	ὥχ[ε]το δ' ἰς Αἴδαο λιποῦς φάο[ς] ἡέλινο· :
10-11	ν.6	πᾶδά τε νηπίαχ[ον] ἀριστῆόν τ' ἅμα πόσιν [:]
11-13	ν.7	[ἐ] κπάγλως ἀκάχησεν ἐπ[ι] ἐ ὦνος ἀμέρθη· :
13-15	ν.8	αὐτὸς δ' ἀ χνύμενος τήνδ' ἰστήλη[ν] ἀνέθηκεν. :
15-17	ν.9	τοῦνομα δ' ο[ῦ] πό σιος Φρόντων φ[ί]λιος κρα τερός τε :
17		μνήμης χ[άριν].

Line 7: ΟΜΜΑΤΔΩΣΤΕ *lapis*. Line 15-16: δὲ [πό] | σιος CALDER, SGO; δ' ο[ῦ] πό | σιος THONEMANN.

²² WILHELM, *Grabinschriften*, 804, 826; J. L. LIGHTFOOT, *The Sibylline Oracles*, 2007, 157-8; cf. above, n.16.

Lines 16-17: φ[ρεσβύ] | τερός τε CALDER, SGO; φ[ίλιος κρα] | τερός τε THONEMANN.

«Here lies the prudent wife of a strong man; her name was Wenawia, and she had the appearance of a prudent-minded (woman). She had a beautiful and lovely face, and eyes like those of a cow (i.e. large and full), but she died short-lived, and she departed for Hades, leaving behind the light of the sun. She grieved her infant child and her excellent husband terribly, since she was deprived of life. He, in his grief, set up this stele. The name of her husband was Phronton, dear and strong. In remembrance.»

This monument is neatly inscribed in a cursive hand of the late third or early fourth century AD. In verses 1 and 3, verse-end coincides with line-end; elsewhere, the mason consistently uses the symbol «:» to indicate the ends of verses. Metrically the poem is of a high standard: verses 4 and 6 both have a lengthened short syllable after the penthemimeral caesura, there are awkward hiatuses in verses 1 (twice) and 7, and the lengthening of the first syllable of πόσιν at the end of verse 6 may be an instance of accent influencing metre.

Verse 1 For the phrase ἀνδρὸς κρατεροῦ, see also No. 2 below, verse 1, ἄνδρα κρατερόν, and No. 3 below, verse 1, ἀνὴρ κρατερός. The distinctively feminine quality of «prudence» (πινυτή) was particularly prized in inner Anatolia: it is attributed to women in Nos. 5, 7 and 9 below (the «Çeşmelisebil poet»), as well as in MAMA VII 584–5 (SGO III 14/03/04–05: Zengen); MAMA VII 155 (SGO III 16/57/01: Hadrianoupolis); H. S. CRONIN, JHS 22, 1902, 349, no. 89 (Konya). In Christian texts, it is occasionally used of men, particularly of priests: see e.g. I.Konya 206 (Savatra), ἱερεὺς ... πινυτός; MAMA XI 303 (Karakaya, near Konya), πινυτήν Θ(εο)ῦ σεμνὸν ἱερεῖα;²³ SEG 42, 1183 (Pessinous).

Verse 2 The adjective πινυτόφρων does not appear in Homer, although it is common enough in verse epitaphs (I.Pisid.Cen. 118 [SGO IV 18/02/01], Ariassos; SGO II 08/01/18, Kyzikos) and in later imperial Greek verse (e.g. Nonnus, Dion. 16.185 and elsewhere; Quint. Smyrn. 14.630). The genitive πινυτόφρονος is difficult; we can hardly take it with ἀνδρός in verse 1. I assume that the intended sense is «appearance (εἶδος) of a prudent-minded (person)».

²³ The form πινυτήν is very surprising, but seems unlikely to be a mason's error; cf. in the same text, Πέτρῳ πινυτῇ (line 9). Possibly the author was attempting to use an anomalous adjectival formation *πινυτήν/-ές (thus indexed in MAMA XI); alternatively, the strong «feminine» connotations of the adjective πινυτός may have led him to use a feminine form here. Note an incorrect cross-reference in the commentary to MAMA XI 207: for «cf. 216 below (Konya)», read «cf. 303 below (Konya)».

Verse 3 For χαρίεν ... πρόσωπ[ον], cf. Il. 18.24, χαρίεν δ' ἥσχυνε πρόσωπον. The form ἦτο (=ῆν) appears to be a simplified imperfect of the verb εἰμί, modelled on the middle-passive. Only a few other instances of this form are known (SEG 26, 730 [Pelagonia, II/I BC]; SEG 51, 1735 [SGO IV 19/21/02, c. IV AD]), but the first-person imperfect form ἦμην is common in Roman Anatolia (e.g. MAMA VIII 353; SEG 19, 808; M. WAELKENS, Die Kleinasiatischen Türsteine, 1986, 185-6, no. 463); see BRIKHE, Essai, 85. Alternatively, it is conceivable that we should read ἦ τὸ πρόσωπον; the third-person singular ἦ is attested in papyri of the Roman imperial period (F. T. GIGNAC, A Grammar of the Greek and Roman Papyri II, 1981, 403). For ἦτυ (i.e. ἦτοι), cf. MAMA I 232 (SGO III 14/06/20: Dedeler), and the commentary to No. 13 below, verse 2.

Verse 4 The phrase ὄμματα δ' ὥστε βοός is an expansion of the Homeric epithet βοῶπις (LfgrE Band II, cols. 91-2). μινυνθάδιος is a rare poetic term (seven instances in Homer: LfgrE Band III, cols. 223-4) meaning «short-lived»; cf. the Homeric μινυνθάδιος δέ οἱ αἰὼν, «his span of life was short-lived» (Il. 4.478; 17.302); μινυνθαδίω δὲ γενέσθην (Od. 11.307). The «Zivariḱ poet» uses the same phrase in No. 4 below, verse 5 (μινυνθάδειος δ' ἔτελεύτα), and compare No. 3 below, verse 6 (ὀλιγοχρόνιος δ' ἔτελεύτα).

Verse 5 ὥχετο δ' ἰς Αἴδαο is a quotation of Il. 22.213, ὥχετο δ' εἰς Αἴδαο. The second half of the verse, λιποῦς φάος] ἠελίνο, is modelled on the Homeric λιπὼν φάος ἠελίοιο (Od. 11.93, cf. Il. 18.11); the phrase is reworked in No. 10 below (the «Koças poet»), verse 3, λιπὼν φάος ἐνθάδε κῆρ. The form λιποῦς, apparently for λιποῦσ(α), is baffling; I can find no close parallels.

Verse 6 πῆδ' ἀ τε νηπίαχ[ον] is a quotation from Il. 6.408, παῖδ' ἀ τε νηπίαχον (of Astyanax); the adjective νηπίαχος probably also appears in MAMA I 88 (SGO III 14/06/09: Ladik), line 9 (W. PEEK, Gnomon 7, 1931, 531: νηπι[ά]χ[ου]). The adjective ἀριστῆον – implausibly glossed by MERKELBACH and STAUBER as ἀριστεῖον – appears to be an attempt to produce a masculine accusative singular for the Homeric adjective ἀριστεύς (correctly ἀριστῆα). Note the metrical lengthening of the first syllable of πόσιιν, which may be an early instance of the influence of accent on metre (J. FRASER, in Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire, ed. W. M. RAMSAY, 1906, 152-3); cf. No. 4 below, verse 4.

Verse 7 ἐπ[ὶ] ἐ] | ὤνιος ἀμέρθη, i.e. ἐπεὶ αἰὼνιος ἀμέρθη, «since she was deprived of life», with an awkward hiatus; the phrase is modelled on Il. 22.58, μὴ ... φίλης αἰὼνιος ἀμέρθης.

Verse 9 τοῦνομα δὲ [πό] | σιος CALDER; I have restored δ' ο[ὗ] πό] | σιος for the sake of the metre. At the end of the verse, CALDER (followed by MERKELBACH and STAUBER) restored φ[ρεσβύ] | τερός τε (lines 16-17). This is both unmetrical and ungrammatical, and would introduce the sole explicitly Christian term in this poet's entire corpus. It is better to assume that the poet has in

mind the Homeric formulae ἐνὴέα τε κρατερὸν τε, «gentle and strong» (of Patroklos: Il. 12.204, 21.96) and ἀμύμονά τε κρατερὸν τε, «noble and strong» (Il. 4.89, 5.169, 18.55, 21.546). I therefore suggest restoring φ[ίλιος κρᾱ] | τερός τε. For the adjective φίλιος in this context, cf. e.g. SGO V 24/25 (Savatra), μνήμ' ἀλόχῳ φιλήϊ;²⁴ MAMA VIII 221a (SGO III 14/10/01: Kana), φιλίοις τεκέεσσι. Alternatively, we might consider restoring φ[ίλος τε κρᾱ] | τερός τε, although this would be unmetrical; the combination πόσις ... φίλος is also found in MAMA VII 232 (SGO III 16/45/05: Turgut).

For the concluding supermetrical μνήμης χάριν, cf. MAMA VII 239 (SGO III 16/45/07: Turgut).

2. Verse epitaph for Valerianus and Romana

«Gravé sur une pierre tombale à double cadre: les trois premiers vers sont dans le cadre de gauche; les autres, à droite. Feuille de figuier après le mot αἶα.» (W. M. CALDER; no facsimile.) Zivarik (W. M. CALDER, 1910).

Ht. –; W. –; Th. –; letters –.

W. M. CALDER, RPh 46/2, 1922, 120-1, no. 4 (SEG 1, 451; W. PEEK, Griechische Versinschriften, 1955, 792; SGO III 14/06/21).

1-3	v.1	ἐνθ' ἄνδρα κρατερὸν κατέχει φυσίζο ος αἶα,
4-6	v.2	τοῦνομα Οὐα ρελειανός, ὅς ἔξο χος ἦν καὶ ἀληθής,
7-9	v.3	ὄλβον τε κτησίν τε ἐοῖς τεκέ(ε)σσιν ἀφῆ κεν.
10-12	v.4	τοῦδ' ἄλοχος πολὺ δωρος, ἀτὰρ κατ' ἐ πᾶλτ' Ἀῖδος δῶ,
13-15	v.5	τοῦνομα Ῥωμᾶνα, πόσειος ποθέου σα σαόφρων
16-18	v.6	κάλλος ἀμείμη τον, μελίρυτος ἡ δ' ἀγανόφρων.
19-20	v.7	τοκήων δ' ἡπείων Ἀλέ ξανδρος μνήμ' ἐτέλεσ[σε]ν.

Line 8: τέκεσσιν CALDER.

²⁴ First published in I.Konya 124; the text in SGO V 24/25 incorporates the corrections of P. THONEMANN, EpigAnat 36, 2003, 91. I would now propose the following, improved text: μνήμ' ἀλόχῳ | φιλήϊ Ἀγάθις | τεῦξεν Κομοδι | [ι]ανῆ / καὶ θυγατρ[ι] | (5) Μαξίμη μνήμης χ[ά] | ριν, οὐνεκα πᾶ[σ] | αν / ἔσχεν ὁμο | φροσύνην ἀρε | τῆς τῆν ἔξοχα | (10) πασῶν, «Agathis built this memorial for his dear wife Komodiane and his daughter Maxima, in remembrance, since they possessed a complete consensus of virtue, which was outstanding among all women». For the name Κομοδιανή, cf. I.Iznik 1237.

«The life-giving earth holds a strong man here, whose name was Valerianus, who was outstanding and true, and left wealth and possessions to his children. His wife was wooed with many gifts, but she leaped down to the house of Hades; her name was Romana, and she, self-restrained woman, longed for the inimitable beauty of her husband, she who had a honey-flowing tongue and was gentle of mood. Alexandros finished this memorial of his gentle parents.»

The form of the monument is unclear; CALDER's brief description («pierre tombale à double cadre») shows that it carried two separate inscribed panels, like many monuments of this region (e.g. MAMA I 175; MAMA VII 69). Line-division coincides with verse-division throughout, as in No. 4 below, even at the expense of some very short lines (line 3, line 9). For the most part, this epigram is metrically sound; verse 6 has a lengthened short syllable after the penthemimeral caesura, as in No. 1 above, verses 4 and 6. There is, however, a remarkable metrical lapse at the beginning of verse 7, for which I can offer no good explanation.

This text has close connections with a verse inscription from the nearby village of Dedeler (some 12km west of Zivarı), MAMA I 232 (SGO III 14/06/20). The Dedeler epitaph was also erected for a certain Οὐαρελιανός, and the two texts share a significant amount of vocabulary (ἀγανόφρων, ὄλβος/ὄλβιος, τοκήων). However, they seem to be the work of different poets, and it is perhaps best to see the two deceased men as kinsmen. One epitaph may well have been composed in knowledge of the other, although I cannot say which of the two texts might be the earlier.

Verse 1 The half-line κατέχει φυσίζοος αἶα derives from Od. 11.301 (cf. Il. 3.243). For the combination with (ἄνδρα) κρατερόν, cf. Il. 21.63, γῆ φυσίζοος, ἥ τε κατὰ κρατερόν περ ἐρύκει. The sense is identical to the first verse of No. 3 below.

Verse 2 The name Οὐα|ρελιανός has to scan – UU – U for the sake of the metre. The metathesis of *rho* and *lambda* is characteristic of the Axylon: cf. MAMA I 232 (SGO III 14/06/20: Οὐαρελιανόν), MAMA I 292 (Οὐαρελλιανῆ); MAMA VII 351 (Οὐαρελίω), MAMA VII 570 (Οὐαρυλιανοῦ); BRIKHE, Essai, 113. For ἔξοχος in this metrical position, cf. e.g. Od. 18.205, ἐπεὶ ἔξοχος ἦεν Ἀχαιῶν.

Verse 3 τέκεσσιν CALDER's notebook: «Je ne sais si la faute (pour τεκέεσσιν) est imputable au lapicide ou à moi» (CALDER). For the emphasis on wealth (ὄλβον τε κτήσιν τε), cf. No. 6 below (the «Çeşmelisebil poet»), verse 2, with commentary; the farmers of the Axylon were proud of their material wealth.

Verse 4 The phrase ἄλοχος πολύδωρος (in this metrical position) is Homeric (Il. 6.394, 22.88; Od. 24.294). The verb κατεπᾶλτο, «(s)he leaped down», appears (in a rather different context) in Il. 19.351 (οὐρανοῦ ἔκ κατεπᾶλτο δι' αἰθέρος: LfgrE Band I, col. 547). It is conceivable that the poet construed κατεπᾶλτο with a direct object; cf. SEG 6, 567 (SGO IV 16/61/99: Pisidian Antioch), [Ἀῖ]δος κατέβη [δῶ], and see further the commentary to No. 15 below, verse 1. Alternatively, we could read the phrase as κατ' ἐ|πᾶλτ' Ἀῖδος δῶ, on the model of Od. 11.571, κατ' εὐρυπυλῆς Ἀῖδος δῶ; Il. 23.74, ἀν' εὐρυπυλῆς Ἀῖδος δῶ.

Verse 5 The phrase πόσ(ε)ιος ποθέουσα ... κάλλος ἀμ(ε)ίμητον (wrongly punctuated by MERKELBACH and STAUBER) is modelled on Od. 18.204-5, πόσιος ποθέουσα φίλοιο / παντοίην ἀρετήν, «longing for the manifold virtue of my dear husband». The sequence of clauses is rather awkward here.

Verse 6 The adjectives ἀμ(ε)ίμητος and μελί(ρ)ρυτος are not Homeric; ἀγανόφρων appears in Il. 20.467 (cf. Il. 24.772, Od. 11.203), and (of a man) in a verse epitaph from nearby Dedeler, MAMA I 232 (SGO III 14/06/20). The epithet μελίρρυτος refers specifically to Romana's sweet speech: cf. Il. 1.249, τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή, «from whose tongue flowed speech sweeter than honey».

Verse 7 The initial phrase, τοκήων δ' ἡπείων, is unmetrical; in Homer, the genitive plural τοκήων always comes at line-end, as in MAMA I 232 (SGO III 14/06/20: Dedeler), verse 4, ἀγαθῶν τε τοκήων. PEEK suggests that the author may have intended ἡπείων τοκέων δ'. For the scansion of Ἀλέξανδρος, cf. WILHELM, Grabinschriften, 802 (short syllables not always lengthened before xi in verse epigraphy).

3. Verse epitaph for Apollinaris

Limestone block, complete. Inscription in plain *tabula ansata*. **Fig. 2** (photograph).

Keşlik Yaylası, at a place known as «han öreni», c. 8km west of Zıvarık (F. MILTNER, 1934); subsequently in Konya Museum (B. H. MCLEAN, 1995).

Ht. 0.75; W. 1.10; Th. 0.28; letters 0.030. [Thus MILTNER; MCLEAN gives «Ht. 1.09, W. 0.78» (*sic*), but his own photograph shows that the monument is broader than it is tall.]

F. MILTNER, Wiener Studien 53, 1935, 150-4 (SGO III 14/07/09); B. H. MCLEAN, I.Konya 133 (SEG 52, 1456ter; SGO V 24/20).

1-2	v.1	ἐνθάδ' ἀνὴρ κρατερός κεῖτ' ἐν χθον ῖ πουλυβοτείρῃ,
2-3	v.2	τοῦνομα Ἀπολινάρ ις υἱὸς Παύλου· ὀπλότατος δ' ἦν
3-5	v.3	ῶν τε κασιγνήτων, πρῶτος δ' αὐτὸς ἐτελεύτα.

5-6	v.4	τοῦ δ' ἰσχὺς μεγάλη, ἔ ργοισι δὲ πάντας ἐν)εῖκα
6-8	v.5	ἐν πάτρῃ· οὐδὲς γὰρ ἐδύνατο τούτου ἐρί ζειν·
8-9	v.6	ἦν γὰρ ἀνείκητος· ὀλιγοχρ όνειος δ' ἐτελεύτα.
9-10	v.7	τύμβον δ' ἄ νέστησεν κασίγνητός τ' υἱός τε
11-12	v.8	Κατμαρος καὶ Παῦλος μνήμης χάριν ἐξονομέντες.

Line 6: HEIKA *lapis*.

«Here lies a strong man in the much-nourishing earth, whose name was Apollinaris, son of Paulus; he was the youngest of his brothers, and he was the first to meet his end. He had great strength, and he defeated everyone in his deeds in his homeland; for no-one was able to compete with him, for he was undefeated. But he died short-lived. His brother and his son, whose names were Katmaros and Paulus, set up this tomb in remembrance.»

As noted in the introduction to the «Zivarik poet» above, the style of monument, dimensions, and (apparently) hand are all identical to No. 4 below. The epitaph includes two striking metrical errors, the lengthened second syllable of αὐτός in verse 3, and the necessity for τύμβον δ' ἄν- in verse 7 to scan as a dactyl. Verse 7 is a rare example of an epitaphic hexameter with a spondaic fifth foot, and also has a lengthened short syllable after the penthemimeral caesura, as often in the work of this poet; note the hiatus at the caesura in verse 4, and the awkward hiatuses in verse 5.

Verse 1 The line-closing formula (ἐπὶ) χθονὶ πολυβοτείρῃ appears a dozen times in Homer; it is also reworked in this region in MAMA VII 587 (SGO III 14/04/03: Kolukisa), ὑπὸ χθόνα πολυβοτίρην, and in an inscription from the Phrygian highlands, SEG 43, 943A (SGO III 16/41/15), ἐπὶ χθονὶ πο[λυβοτείρῃ].

Verse 2 For the unmetrical personal name (very common in Anatolian verse epitaphs), see the commentary to No. 6 below (the «Çeşmelisebil poet»), verse 5.

Verse 3 The correct punctuation of verses 2-3 is uncertain. As punctuated here (thus MERKELBACH and STAUBER, SGO III 14/07/09), the word τε at the start of verse 3 is senseless (albeit metrically necessary). Alternatively, we could punctuate τοῦνομα Ἀπολινάρις· υἱὸς Παύλου ὀπλότατος δ' ἦν· / ὧν τε κασιγνήτων πρῶτος δ' αὐτὸς ἐτελεύτα (thus MERKELBACH and STAUBER, SGO V 24/20); however, this involves assuming a badly misplaced δ(έ) both in verse 2 and in verse 3. Note the awkward lengthening of the second syllable of αὐτός at the end of verse

3; a reader for the journal suggests that this may be a mason's error for αὐτ(ῶν).

Verse 4 Verses 4-6 appear to describe (in somewhat pleonastic language) Apollinaris' athletic supremacy in his home-town (either his native village, whatever its name was, or the nearby town of Perta); the phrase ἔργοισι δὲ πάντας ἐνείκα is an adaptation of the Homeric πόδεσσι δὲ πάντας ἐνείκα (Il. 20.410, of the Trojan Polydoros). I see no way of telling what Apollinaris' preferred sport might have been (perhaps boxing or wrestling?). For another successful athlete from this region, commemorated in very similar language, cf. MAMA VII 582 (SGO III 14/03/02: Zengen), ἄδμητος ἄκανπτος, βίη δ' οἷ πάντας ἐνείκα.

Verse 5 The latter part of this verse recalls Il. 5.172 (ᾗ οὐ τίς τοι ἐρίζεται ἐνθάδε γ' ἀνὴρ) and Od. 4.78 (ἧ τοι Ζηνὶ βροτῶν οὐκ ἄν τις ἐρίζοι); one would have expected τούτῳ for τούτου.

Verse 6 Compare the very similar phrases in No. 1 above, verse 4, and No. 4 below, verse 5. For the adjective ὀλιγοχρόνιος, cf. MAMA VII 232 (SGO III 16/45/05, Turgut), ἄλοχον ... τὴν ὀλιγοχρονίην. The adjective is non-Homeric, but appears e.g. in Mimnermus, Fr. 5 (WEST).

Verse 7 The metrical lengthening after the caesura (κασίγνητος with a lengthened first syllable) is entirely standard for this poet, but verses with a spondaic fifth foot are very rare in Anatolian verse epigraphy (there are no other examples in the fifteen epitaphs studied in this paper). Note the unmetrical δ' after τύμβον at the start of the line.

Verse 8 For the casual metrical treatment of the personal names here, see the commentary to No. 6 below (the «Çeşmelisebil poet»), verse 5. The participle ἐξονομέντες is Homeric in origin: see Il. 3.166 (ἐξονομήνης, verse end); Od. 6.66 (ἐξονομήναι, verse end); cf. also No. 10 below (the «Koças poet»), verse 1 (ἐκ τ' ὀνόμηνε, verse end). The false form -ονομέντες appears to be an attempt to produce an aorist passive participle.

4. Verse epitaph for Gennadeios

Limestone block, broken at bottom right, otherwise complete; back unworked. Inscription in plain *tabula ansata*. **Fig. 3** (photograph).

Zıvarık, in the wall of the mosque (T. CALLANDER, 1904; W. M. CALDER 1910, 1925).

Ht. 0.74; W. 1.30; Th. 0.15–0.25; letters 0.025–0.040.

T. CALLANDER, in *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, ed. W. M. RAMSAY, 1906, 175 no. 64; W. M. CALDER, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 8, 1924, 358-60; W. M.

CALDER, MAMA I 157 (SEG 6, 343; W. TABBERNEE, *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia*, 1997, 330-4, no. 56 [with full bibliography]; SGO III 14/06/03).

Cf. H. GRÉGOIRE, *Byzantion* 1, 1924, 709-10; *id.*, *Byzantion* 8, 1933, 65-9; WILHELM, *Grabinschriften*,

826-34.

1-2	ν.1	τύμβον Γενναδείου πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
3-4	ν.2	ἐξετέλεσαν· ὁ γὰρ γέ νος πάτρην τ' ἀκάχησεν,
5-6	ν.3	ποιμένον τ' ἐπ' ὄεσσι, <μ>ο{ι} ρο[ρ]ραφείην γὰρ ἀνέτλη
7-8	ν.4	οἵκτιστον θνήσκων καὶ δυσμενέων ἀνοσείων·
9-10	ν.5	<ν>ήπιος ὦν ἐταίων, μινυνθά δειος δ' ἐτελεύτα.

Line 5: ΟΕΣΣΙΝΟΙ *lapis*; ὄεσσιν ὁ ἰ|ρο[γ]ραφείην CALDER; ὄεσσιν θι|ρο[τ]ραφείην GRÉGOIRE; ὄεσσι <μ>ο{ι} | ρο[ρ]ραφείην THONEMANN. Line 9: ἡπιος CALDER, *alii*; <ν>ήπιος THONEMANN.

«The tomb of Gennadeios, his father and revered mother completed it. For he grieved his family and his homeland, having been a shepherd over his flock, for he suffered a fatal plot, dying most piteously, and at the hands of unholy enemies. He was young in years, and he died short-lived.»

Like Nos. 1 and 3 above, this monument was beautifully inscribed (perhaps by the same mason as No. 3); note the perfect correspondence of line-end and verse-end, as in No. 2 above.

Metrically the epigram is fairly sound, assuming that my reconstruction of verse 3 is correct; traditional restorations involve assuming a grievous blunder in the third metron, of a kind committed almost nowhere else by this poet (though cf. No. 2 above, verse 7). As in his other works, the «Zivarik poet» frequently places a short syllable after the penthemimeral caesura (verses 1, 2 and 5); note also the lengthened penultimate syllable of ἀνοσ(ε)ίων in verse 4.

Verse 2 The verbs (ἐκ)τελέω and ἀχέω are both used elsewhere by this poet (No. 1 above, verse 7, and No. 2, verse 7). For πατρή in this context, cf. MAMA VII 560 (SGO III 14/02/04: Kuyulusebil), ὃς πάτρην ἀκάχησε θανών; for other instances of the verb ἀχέω in this region, see the commentary to No. 13 below, verse 3.

Verse 3 The first part of the verse derives from Homer, Il. 6.25 (ποιμαίνων δ' ἐπ' ὄεσσι), 11.106 (ποιμαίνοντ' ἐπ' ὄεσσι). CALDER gives the wrong word-division ποιμέν' ὄντ' ἐπ' ὄεσσιν (thus still TABBERNEE), corrected by GRÉGOIRE to ποιμένον (i.e. ποιμαίνων) τ' ἐπ' ὄεσσιν; MERKELBACH and STAUBER wished to read the accusative participle ποιμένοντ' ἐπ' ὄεσσιν. The second half of the verse is a notorious problem. CALDER read ὁ ἰ|ρο[γ]ραφείην γὰρ ἀνέτλη, and interpreted the phrase to mean «he endured (the prophecy of) Holy Scripture»; S. MITCHELL, JRS 78, 1988, 105 n.4 more plausibly took the putative term ἱ(ε)ρογραφίη as a synonym for *hiera grammata*, an «imperial edict». In either case, Gennadeios would thus have died as a Christian martyr «at the hands of unholy enemies», with ποιμαίνων bearing an allegorical sense («bishop over his flock»).

However, this whole story of Gennadeios' «martyrdom» is highly dubious. With the reading $\acute{\iota}|\rho\omicron[\gamma]|\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\nu$ in lines 5-6, the pronoun $\acute{\omicron}$ is both unmetrical and unnecessary for the sense (Gennadeios is already the subject of the previous clause), and the postponement of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ is very ugly, particularly given its correct position in the previous verse ($\acute{\omicron}\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$). Hence GRÉGOIRE (followed by WILHELM) argued that Gennadeios was not a martyr at all, but simply a youthful shepherd. $\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omega\nu$ carries its literal sense, and Gennadeios' death came (presumably) at the hands of bandits or sheep-rustlers; cf. MAMA I 286, a tombstone of another young shepherd from the Axylon who was «torn apart by wolves» ($\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\ \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\omega\nu$). Both GRÉGOIRE and WILHELM wished to read $\theta\iota|\rho\omicron[\tau]|\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\nu$, i.e. «he endured being sent out to rear the animals». However, it is far from clear that a putative noun $\theta\eta\rho\omicron\tau\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}$ could carry the desired sense: a $\theta\acute{\eta}\rho$ is a wild beast, not a domesticated animal. Hence a third possibility might be considered. Given that the verb $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$ ought to mean «endure», the Homeric term $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\rho\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}$, «evil contrivance» (Il. 15.16; Od. 2.236, 12.26; LfgrE Band II, cols. 1280-1) would fit the sense perfectly here. I would suggest that the «Zivarik poet» has coined his own synonym for this term, namely $\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\rho\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}$ (cf. Od. 16.422-3, $\tau\eta\lambda\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omega\ \theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \mu\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$). This gives perfect metre and sense, but does involve the assumption of two distinct mason's errors (nu for mu after $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\iota$, and a superfluous *iota* at the end of the line). For the verb $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\eta$ at verse-end, cf. Od. 10.327 ($\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\kappa'\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\eta$), 14.47 ($\kappa\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon'\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\eta\varsigma$).

Verse 4 For the phrase $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\eta\eta\sigma\kappa\omega\nu$, cf. Od. 12.342, $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$. ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$) $\delta\upsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ are common in Homer, but the combination with $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (possibly, but not necessarily, implying that Gennadeios was a Christian) seems to be the author's own innovation. The lengthening of the penultimate syllable of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ may be a case of accent guiding metre (cf. No. 1, verse 6); the orthography $-\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}-$ for $-\acute{\iota}-$ may be influenced by metrical considerations (see the commentary to No. 11, verse 3).

Verse 5 All previous editors have printed $\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ without comment. However, the position of $\delta(\acute{\epsilon})$ forbids us from construing $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ with the following $\mu\iota\nu\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$, and «gentle in years» is no more plausible in Greek than in English. Sense can easily be restored by assuming a haplography of nu on the part of the mason (although the line-break makes this slightly more awkward). The phrase $\mu\iota\nu\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \delta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\tau\alpha$ was a favourite of this poet: cf. No. 1 above, verse 4 ($\mu\iota\nu\nu\theta\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\eta\ \delta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\tau\alpha$); No. 3 above, verse 6 ($\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\gamma\omicron\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \delta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\tau\alpha$).

III. The «Çeşmelisebil Poet» (Nos. 5–9)

This poet has an easily recognisable style. He makes very extensive use of Homeric and quasi-Homeric adjectives and adjectival combinations in $\mu\omicron\lambda\upsilon-$ ($\mu\omicron\lambda\upsilon\eta\acute{\rho}\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Nos. 5 and 7; $\mu\omicron\lambda\upsilon\ \phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Nos. 5 and 8; $\mu\omicron\lambda\upsilon\rho(\rho)\eta\nu\omicron\varsigma$,

πολυβούτης and πολὺ σεμνοτάτη, No. 6; πολύολβος and πολύκνδος, No. 7). Several verses are repeated virtually unchanged from one text to another (all in Nos. 5–7: 5.5=6.6; 5.6-7=7.3; 5.9=7.6; 6.1=7.1; 6.4=7.5). His understanding of Homer was not faultless: note his misinterpretation of the rare Homeric word τυμβοχορή (No. 6, verse 1); his misuse of the noun ἀγλαΐη (No. 7, verse 2); his inappropriate use of περ (No. 5, verse 4; No. 9, verse 3); and the incorrect «feminine» termination ἀμωμήτην/ἀμωμήτη (No. 5, verse 5; No. 6, verse 6).

I have attributed five texts to the «Çeşmelisebil Poet», all of them deriving from the village of Çeşmelisebil (ancient Gdanmaa), deep in the steppe west of Lake Tatta (Tuz gölü).²⁵ The first three of these (Nos. 5–7) share a great deal of phraseology (not to mention their explicitly Christian character) and can be attributed to a single author with complete confidence. No. 8 includes only a single line of verse, and its attribution to the «Çeşmelisebil Poet» is thus doubtful; however, the style is similar enough to Nos. 5–7 (note especially the concluding phrase πολὺ φίλτατος ἦεν) to make the attribution plausible. The attribution of No. 9 is also uncertain, but the general shape of verse 3 is strikingly similar to verse 4 of No. 5 below (including the misuse of the particle περ). In contrast to Nos. 5–7, Nos. 8–9 do not contain any explicitly Christian language.

5. Verse epitaph for Glykera

Limestone block, broken at left, otherwise apparently complete. Inscription in recessed panel within *tabula ansata*. On upper moulding (left to right): swastika, *chi-rho* christogram, swastika, rosette. To the right of the inscription, two diamonds in relief. **Fig. 4** (photograph).

Çeşmelisebil, in a pile of rubble to the south of the *höyük* (W. M. CALDER, 1954); behind the Belediye (P. THONEMANN, 2011).

Ht. 1.15; W. 1.34+; Th. 0.25–0.30; letters 0.020–0.040.

P. THONEMANN, MAMA XI 208 (without restorations, and with several inaccurate readings)

1	v.1	[?Αὐρ. Διομ]ήδης ννν. Γελασίου πολυήρατος ἀνὴρ,
2-3	v.2	[ὄν πάντες κ]λείουσι βροτοὶ πολὺ φίλτατον ὄν [τα,]

²⁵ K. BELKE, TIB 4: Galatien und Lykaonien, 1984, 166, s.v. Gdanmaa; M. WAELEKENS, Die Kleinasiatischen Türsteine, 1986, 251; MAMA XI, p. xxv.

3-4	ν.3	[ὡς ἔσο]ρᾷς περικαλλὲς ἀνέ(σ)τησεν τόδε [σῆμα],
4-5	ν.4	[καὶ] τεῖμησ' ἄλοχον {α} Γλυκερὴν κυδιμ [ὄν περ ἐοῦσ]αν,
5-6	ν.5	πτωχῶν θρέπτειραν ἀμ [ωμήτ]ην τε σοφὴν τε,
6-7	ν.6	ἣ σοφίης τ' ἐκέκασ [το κέ] εὐσεβίῃ ἐρατείνῃ
7-8	ν.7	κάλλι καὶ πινυτῇ [. . c. 3-4 . . σ]ωφροσύνην ἐνεποῦσα
8-10	ν.8	τῇ γ' ὁ μόκοιτος ἀνὴρ Διομῆς χά [ριν ε]ῖσατο μνήμη[ς]·
10-11	ν.9	τίτλον ἀνέσ [τησεν πολυ]ήρατον {Δ} ἔξοχον ἔργον.

Line 1: [- -]ῖδης THONEMANN (MAMA XI). Line 2: [- -]αενουσι THONEMANN (MAMA XI). Line 3: ANETῒΗΣEN *lapis*. Line 6: σοφὴν τ' ἔης σοφίης THONEMANN (MAMA XI). Line 8: [- -σ]ωφροσύνη μὲν ἐποῦσα τῇ ΓΟ THONEMANN (MAMA XI). Lines 9-10: [- -]ρο Κόιντος ἀνὴ[ρ] ἴδιο[ς](?) μῆς χά | [ριν] THONEMANN (MAMA XI).

«Aur. Diomedes, son of Gelasios, a much-loved man, whom all mortals celebrate, being far the dearest; as you see, he set up this very beautiful tomb, and honoured his wife Glykera, glorious as she was, a blameless and wise nurse of beggars, who excelled in wisdom and lovely piety, beauty and prudence, speaking ... self-restraint; for her, her husband and bedmate Diomes set this up, in remembrance; he set up the inscription, a lovely and outstanding work.»

Verse 1 I have restored the name [Διομ]ῆδης on the basis of verse 8 below (Διομῆς: see commentary *ad loc.*). The restoration of the *nomen* Αὐρ(ηλίου) at the start of the line is uncertain, but for the unmetrical use of the abbreviated Aurelian *nomen* by this poet, cf. No. 6 below, verse 5 (Αὐρ. Νονη; see the commentary *ad loc.*). The adjective πολυήρατος is Homeric, albeit nowhere used of individuals: Od. 11.275; 15.126; 15.366; 23.354 (LfgrE Band III, col. 1390).

Verse 2 For the sentiment here, cf. SEG 34, 1409 (SGO III 13/10/01: Venasa), ὃν φίλησαν βροτοὶ ἅπαντες; KILyk 406 (SGO III 14/13/05: Dorla [Aydoğmuş]), ὃν πάντες φίλεον μέροπες; SGO III 14/07/06 (Ikonion), ὃν πάντες ἐφίλησαν. The phrase πολὺ φίλτατος (in this metrical position) is Homeric: see e.g. Il. 5.378, Αἰνείαν, ὃς ἐμοὶ πολὺ φίλτατός ἐστιν. Cf. also No. 8 below, verse 1, πολὺ φίλτατος ἦεν; MAMA VII 560 (SGO III 14/02/04: Kuyulusebil), ἐπ(ε)ὶ πολὺ φίλτατος ἦεν; T. CALLANDER, in *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, ed. W. M. RAMSAY, 1906, 161, no. 17 (Savatra, not in SGO), ζωὸς γὰρ [ρ] ὦν πολὺ φ[ίλτ]ατος ἦεν; H. S. CRONIN, JHS 22, 1902, 360, no. 121 (Zazadin Hanı, not in SGO), [πο]λὺ φίλτατον ἄνδρα; SGO III 16/23/10 (Tiberiopolis: see MAMA X, p.187 no. 66). For the verb κλείουσι, «celebrate», cf. Od. 1.338, 17.418; for the sense, cf. SGO III 16/31/82 (Appia), θεὸς δῶκεν κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐν μερόπεσιν.

Verse 3 For the phrase [ὡς ἐσο]ρᾷς ... [σῆμα], cf. MAMA VII 241 (SGO III 16/45/02: Turgut), τύμβω τῷδ' ὄν ὁρᾷς; SEG 35, 1406 (SGO IV 18/01/19: Termessos), ἦν δ' ἐσορᾷς στήλην θήκαντο φίλοι ποθέοντες; IGUR III 1208, ἐνθάδ' Ἔρωσ κεῖμαι ὑποτύμβιος, ὡς ἐσορᾷτε. For the direct address to the viewer, see WILHELM, Grabinschriften, 809-16. The Homeric adjective περικαλλής is used of a tomb (περικαλλέα τύμβον) in No. 14 below (Kuyulusebil), verse 6, and in MAMA VII 561 (SGO III 14/02/03: Kuyulusebil). For the half-line ἀνέστησεν τόδε σῆμα, cf. MAMA VII 230 (SGO III 16/45/03: Turgut); KILyk 251 (SGO III 14/11/01: Çeşme).

Verse 4 For the verb τείμησ(ε), cf. No. 7 below, verse 4. The phrase κυδιμόν περ ἐοῦσαν (note the artificial shortening of κυδ- in κυδιμόν) is based on the Homeric phrase πινυτή περ ἐοῦσα, «wise though she is» (Od. 20.131, 21.103, 23.361); cf. No. 9 below, verse 3, πινυτῆς περ ἐούσης. However, in the Homeric model, περ is concessive (J. D. DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*, second edition, 1950, 484-6); in both this text and No. 9 below, it appears to be used as an intensive, «very glorious/wise as she was».

Verse 5 This verse is recycled (in the dative case) as verse 6 of No. 6 below. In both instances, the line is metrically faulty: the last syllable of θρέπτειραν is here treated as long (cf. the form θρεφθή(ρ)α in No. 6 below, verse 6), and the initial ἄ- of ἀμωμήτην is lengthened after the penthemimeral caesura (also in No. 6 below, verse 6, with an ugly hiatus). The adjective ἀμώμητος, here with an inaccurate feminine termination, appears in Il. 12.109. The sentiment of the verse is strikingly un-Homeric. For the theme of charity to the poor in Christian funerary epigraphy, cf. SEG 6, 119 (SGO III 16/32/03: Kotiaion), τὸν πτωχοὺς φιλέοντα, and the examples collected by WILHELM, Grabinschriften, 795.

Verse 6 For the phrase σοφίης τ' ἐκέκαστο, cf. SGO III 14/03/12 (Nea Isaura), παντοίη(ς) σοφίησι κεκασμένον; IGUR III 1260, σοφίαισι κεκασμένον; IG XIV 2379 (SEG 48, 1304: tombstone of a Galatian, provenance unknown), ὃς πάση σοφίῃ τε καὶ ἀγλαίῃ ἐκέκαστο; SEG 52, 1457 (SGO V 24/19: Dağdere), σοφίης δὲ πάσης ἐκέκαστο. The verb καίνυμαι is used with both genitive and dative in verse epitaphs of inner Anatolia (cf. No. 12 below [the «Zengen poet»], line 1), but the second half of the line (καὶ εὐσεβίῃ ἐρατείνῃ) shows that the dative plural is intended here (σοφίης, i.e. σοφαίς). The poet recycled the second half of verse 6 and the first half of verse 7 in No. 7 below, verse 3. The line-end εὐσεβίῃ ἐρατείνῃ may be based on Il. 6.156-7, τῷ δὲ (Bellerophon) θεοὶ κάλλος τε καὶ ἡνορέην ἐρατεινὴν / ὥπασαν (note κάλλ(ε) in verse 7); cf. the commentary to No. 11 below (the «Koças poet»), verse 2.

Verse 7 For the combination κάλλ(ε) καὶ πινυτῇ, compare Od. 20.70-1, Ἥρῃ δ' αὐτῇσιν περὶ πασέων δῶκε γυναικῶν / εἶδος καὶ πινυτῇ. For the quality of prudence (πινυτή) in inner Anatolia, see the commentary to No. 1 above (the «Zivarık poet»), verse 1, and for the combination of πινυτή and σωφροσύνη, see H. S. CRONIN, JHS 22, 1902, 349, no. 89 (Konya: not in

SGO). In the second half of the line, the reading [σ]ωφροσύνην ἐνεποῦσα seems certain (the last two *nus* of [σ]ωφροσύνην are inscribed backwards), but it is very hard to see what the intended meaning might be. I have wondered about restoring [κατὰ σ]ωφροσύνην ἐνεποῦσα («whose speech was in accordance with self-restraint»?); C. P. JONES cautiously suggests (*per litt.*) πιτυτῇ[τι σα]ωφροσύνην ἐνεποῦσα; the dative πιτυτῇτι, from a noun πιτυτής, appears in IG XII 3, 869 (Thera), and in Milet I.2, 29.

Verse 8 Assuming that my reconstruction of this verse is correct, the text at the start of line 9 must be virtually complete; contrast lines 6-8 and 10, where there appear to be 3-4 letters missing at the start of each line. We should thus have to assume that line 9 began with a *vacat*. The adjective ὁμόκοιτος is un-Homeric; it serves here as an etymologically explicit synonym for the Homeric ἀκοίτης, «bedfellow» (cf. Plato, Cratylus 405d). Although the first verse of this inscription shows that Glykera's husband was called Διομήδης, the stone carries Διομήης, and the metre here requires an anapaestic word. Διομήης appears to be an affectionate «hypocoristic» nickname of Διομήδης. I cannot find another example of this form, but Διομᾶς, the regular hypocoristic form of Διομήδης, is common in Phrygia: M. WAELEKENS, Die kleinasiatischen Türsteine, 1986, no. 39 (Aizanoi); MAMA X 302 (Kotiaion); SEG 38, 1310 (Dorylaion); SEG 44, 1043 (Dorylaion); MAMA IV 277b and SEG 50, 1278 (Apollo Lairbenos); I.Ancyra 275. For the form εἴσατο (from ἵζω, «set up»), cf. I.Estrema Oriente 382 (Aï Khanoum).

Verse 9 This line reappears in all but identical form in No. 7 below, verse 6.

6. Verse epitaph for Zeno

Limestone block, broken at left, otherwise complete. Inscription in recessed and moulded panel, with blind scalloped tracery at right (and presumably at left). On upper moulding, *alpha* and *omega* flanking an incised monogrammatic cross. **Fig. 5** (photograph).

Çeşmelisebil, precise location not recorded (W. M. CALDER, 1954).

Ht. 1.00; W. 1.26+; Th. 0.18; letters 0.024–0.030.

W. M. CALDER, MAMA VII, p. xxiii [text only] (SGO III 14/02/12); P. THONEMANN, MAMA XI 206.

1-3	ν.1	τυνβοχόες παράγω ν γνῶθι, βροτέ, τίς κατὰ κιτε
3-5	ν.2	ἀφνειὸν Ζήνων α πολύρηνον πολυβού την
5-6	ν.3	ζῶν αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τόδε τίτλον ἔτευξεν
7-8	ν.4	σὺν γεραρῖ ἀλόχῳ, ἦν οἱ πόρε Χρ(ιστὸ)ς Ἰη(σοῦ)ς,
8-10	ν.5	Αὐρ. Νονη πολὺ σεμνοτάτη ἀγα θῇ τε
10-11	ν.6	φθωχῶν θρεφθῆ(ρα) ἅ μωμ(ή)τ)η τε σοφῇ <τε>.

Lines 10-11: φθωχῶν θρεφθῇ ἀμωμη τε σοφῇ (*sic*) *lapis*.

«As you pass this funerary mound, learn, mortal, who lies buried (here): a wealthy man, Zeno, rich in lambs and rich in oxen. While still living, he constructed this tombstone for himself, along with his reverend wife, whom Jesus Christ provided for him, Aur(elia) None, a most exceedingly serious and good woman, a blameless and wise nurse of the poor.»

Verse 1 The word *τυμβοχόες* derives from a *hapax* in Il. 21.322-3, αὐτοῦ οἱ καὶ σῆμα τετεύχεται, οὐδέ τί μιν χρεῶ / ἔσται τυμβοχοῆς, ὅτε μιν θάπτωσιν Ἀχαιοί, «his tomb shall be built there on the spot, nor will he have any need of a funeral mound, when the Achaians bury him». The interpretation and accentuation of the term was controversial in antiquity (M. L. WEST, *Glotta* 77, 2001, 135; *Lfgre* Band IV, col. 672). The author of RECAM II 392 (SGO III 15/01/01: Burunkuyu) correctly interpreted it as a noun *τυμβοχοή* (verse 14, παισὶν ἐπὶ φθιμένοις τυμβοχοή πρὸ γάμων, «a funeral mound over our deceased children, before their marriage»). To all appearances, the «Çeşmelisebil Poet» understood the word to be an adjective **τυμβοχόης*, here used in the neuter (understanding e.g. σῆμα). MERKELBACH and STAUBER (SGO III 14/02/12) print *τυμβοχοῆς* (i.e. *τυμβοχοαῖς*), and take the word (both here and in SGO III 15/01/01) to mean «Spendengüsse», «libations». For a similar «misreading» of Homeric vocabulary by the «Çeşmelisebil Poet», cf. No. 7, verse 2 below (ἀγλαίην).

Verse 2 The switch from *τίς* in verse 1 to the accusative *Ζήνωνα* in verse 2 is hard to account for (the same switch in No. 7 below, verses 1-2): perhaps, as a reader for the journal suggests, we should understand the imperative *γνῶθι*, «know», as governing two different constructions. The Homeric adjective *ἀφνειός*, «wealthy», also appears in MAMA VII 553 (SGO III 14/02/10: Kuyulusebil), ἀφνιός [τ'] ἀγαθός,²⁶ as in Il. 13.664, 17.576, and in H. S. CRONIN, *JHS* 22, 1902, 360, no. 121 (Zazadin Hanı, not in SGO), ἀφνιός βιότοιο, as in Il. 5.544, 6.14, 14.122. The latter half of the verse derives from the Homeric ἐν δ' ἄνδρες ναίουσι πολύρρηνες πολυβοῦται (Il. 9.154, 9.296; Hesiod, *Fr.* 240.3 MERKELBACH–WEST), with πολύρ(ρ)ηνον (cf. Od. 11.257) employed for πολύρρηνα *metri causa*. The inhabitants of this region were proud of their wealth in livestock: in MAMA VII 239 (SGO III 16/45/07), a funerary epigram from Turgut, ancient Klaneos, a certain Damas boasts of owning 10,000 sheep. For large-scale stock-rearing on the western part of the Anatolian plateau in antiquity, see S. MITCHELL, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, 1993, I 148-9.

²⁶ CALDER, followed by MERKELBACH and STAUBER, prints the unmetrical ἀφνιός ἀγαθός, but the photograph in MAMA VII (Plate 29) suggests that there is room on the stone for ἀφνιός [τ'] ἀγαθός, as in the Homeric model and in SEG 43, 913 (Kaisareia, Paphlagonia).

Verse 3 This unmetrical verse comes as something of a surprise, given the poet's (reasonable) accuracy elsewhere. One could render the line metrical by means of an admittedly speculative transposition: e.g. αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ζω(ὸς ἐὼν) τόδε τίτλον ἔτευξεν. For the sense, compare MAMA IV 212 (SGO III 16/62/03: Apollonia), [ὅς]τις ζωὸς ἐὼν τεύξεν τάφον αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ; RECAM II 347 (SGO III 15/02/13: Büyük Yağcı), ζωὸς ἐὼν τόδ' ἔτευξεν.

Verse 4 ἦν οἱ πόρε (in this metrical position) is a standard Homeric idiom (e.g. Il. 1.72, ἦν διὰ μαντοσύνην, τήν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων). The same verse is recycled (with a supermetrical personal name) in No. 7 below, verse 5.

Verse 5 For the awkward incorporation of the abbreviated Aurelian *nomen*, compare perhaps No. 1 above, verse 1 (restored); MAMA VII 230 (SGO III 16/45/03: Turgut), Αὐ. Λεύκειος Ζωτικοῦ; SEG 6, 281 (SGO III 16/45/11: Yunak), verse 5, where we should read Αὐρ. Διονήσις Ἀνεικήτου; cf. also SGO III 14/16/01 (Vasada), Αὐρήλιος σωθεὶς Διομήδης Λουκίου υἱός. To all appearances, the poet seems here simply to have left a half-line for the personal name, without concerning himself unduly about the scansion. For this phenomenon of the «unmetrical onomastic half-line», cf. No. 3 above, verse 8 (Κατμαρος καὶ Παῦλος); No. 9 below, verse 2 (Μ[α]κ[ε]δόνιος Διομήδους); No. 12 below, verse 2 (Πατροκλῆς καὶ Παῦλος); SGO III 16/45/11 (Αὐρ. Διονήσις Ἀνεικήτου); SGO III 14/13/04 (Ὀρεστεινήν Τιβερίου). Authors of verse epitaphs often recycled verses from other texts, with a new personal name unmetrically substituted for the «original». A neat example is provided by two epitaphs from Zazadın Hanı, near Konya: H. S. CRONIN, JHS 22, 1902, 361, no. 125 (SGO V 24/21), Ἀπολινάριος τοῦνομ' ἔκων, λαοῦ σεμνοῦ μέγα κῦδος; MAMA VIII 320 (SGO III 14/07/03), Γρηγόριος τοῦνομ' ἔκων, [λα]οῦ σεμνοῦ μέγα κῦδος. For other similar examples of onomastic substitution, cf. MAMA X 77 and 89 (SGO III 16/31/90 and 16/31/80: Θεοδώρα and Ἀμμειανή); SGO III 16/07/01–02 (Hierapolis: Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀντωνίου and Ἀβέρκιος). On the treatment of personal names in verse epitaphs, see further the commentary to No. 7 below, verse 5.

Verse 6 As it stands, this verse is a mess. The author seems to have tried to transpose his own hexameter line πτωχῶν θρέπτειραν ἀωμήτην τε σοφὴν τε (No. 5 above, verse 5) into the dative case. The text printed here assumes that the incoherence of the verse as it appears on the stone is the fault of the mason rather than the poet.

7. Verse epitaph for Demetrianē

Stele, broken above, with foliate decoration on sides. **Fig. 6** (squeeze).

Çeşmelisebil, precise location not recorded (W. M. CALDER, 1954).

Ht. 0.95+; W. 0.58; Th. 0.25; letters 0.025–0.035.

1-3	v.1	[τύμβον ἐπερχό]με [νος γνώθι, βρ]οτέ, τίς κατά[κιτ]ε·
3-6	v.2	ἀγλ αίην Δημητριανήν πολύκυδον ἐοῦσ αν
6-8	v.3	κάλλι κὲ πυνι τῇ καὶ εὐσεβίῃ ἐρα τείνῃ·
8-10	v.4	ἦν τείμησ' υἱ ὸς Ἡράκλιος πολύ ολβος
10-12	v.5	〈σ〉ὺν γεραρῇ ἄ λόχῳ Δόμνῃ ἦν οἱ πόρε Χρ(ιστὸ)ς Ἰη(σοῦ)ς·
12-15	v.6	ἰσθήλῃ ν ἀνέστησαν πολυ ήρατον ἔξοχον [ἔργον].

Line 10: ΟΛΒΟΣΥΝ *lapis*.

«[As you appr]oa[ch this tomb, learn, mor]tal, who lies buried (here): a splendid woman, Demetrianē, who was most glorious in beauty, prudence, and lovely piety; she was honoured by her son, the wealthy Heraklios, along with his reverend wife Domna, whom Jesus Christ provided for him; they set up the stele, most lovely, an outstanding [work].»

Verse 1 The sense of this verse appears to be identical to the first verse of No. 6 above. For the verb ἐπέρχεσθαι in this context, cf. IGUR III 1216, σὺ δ' ἀναγνοὺς κλαῦσον, ξεῖνε, τὸν Εὐνόης τύμβον [ἐ]π[ε]ρχό[μ]ενος.

Verse 2 The same irrational shift from τίς in verse 1 to the accusative in verse 2 is found in No. 6 above. At the start of this verse, the Homeric noun ἀγλαΐη (Od. 15.78; 17.310; 18.180; 19.82; LfgrE Band I, cols. 74-5), although metrically correct, is treated (impossibly) as an adjective; the corresponding adjective (ἀγλαήν, ἀγλαόν) would be unmetrical here. For a similar «misinterpretation» of Homeric vocabulary, cf. No. 6 above, verse 1 (τυνβοχόες), and for difficulties with the Homeric noun ἀγλαΐη, cf. No. 12 below (the «Zengen poet»), verse 1. The adjective πολύκυδος is non-Homeric (indeed, is otherwise unattested in pre-Byzantine Greek). It is, however, an easy enough coinage; cf. κυδιμ[όν] in No. 5 above, verse 4 (also of a woman); πολυκύδιμος in MAMA VII 104d (Zivarik).

Verse 3 This whole verse is recycled from No. 5 above, verses 6-7. One can, at a pinch, explain the dative as indicating the content of Demetrianē's κῦδος; but it is better to see the case as having been mechanically preserved from No. 5 above or another model.

Verse 4 For the verb τείμησ(ε), cf. No. 5 above, verse 4. The name Ἡράκλιος is treated as four long syllables for the sake of the metre (contrast its treatment in No. 14 below). The adjective

πολύολβος is non-Homeric, but was used by Sappho (F133 LOBEL-PAGE); it appears regularly in late imperial Greek verse (e.g. Nonnus, Dion. 5.223, 33.254).

Verse 5 This verse is identical to No. 6 above, verse 4, aside from the supermetrical inclusion of the name Δόμνη; the line scans correctly once the name is removed. For supermetrical personal names in Anatolian epitaphs, compare SGO III 13/08/01 (Kırşehir, discussed in the Introduction above); SEG 6, 281 (SGO III 16/45/11: Yunak), where the name Αὐρ. Τατει[ν] is inserted after verse 2. In I.Konya 132 (SGO V 24/27: Bozkır), the first verse reads παρθένος οὔσα καλὴ Μοντάνου κὲ Δόμνης θυγάτηρ ἧς οὔνομα Φροντεῖνα. This appears to be an accurate hexameter designed for a woman with a disyllabic name (παρθένος οὔσα καλὴ θυγάτηρ ἧς οὔνομα <- ->), clumsily reworked for a woman with a trisyllabic name (Φροντεῖνα), with her parents' names (Μοντάνου κὲ Δόμνης) inserted unmetrically at the caesura.²⁷

Verse 6 Aside from the first word (ιστήλην for τίτλον), this verse is identical to verse 9 of No. 5 above. A trochaic word is required here for the metre, and hence ἰστήλην is arguably doubly offensive, although the prothetic *iota* of ἰστήλην need not be reckoned for the scansion (WILHELM, Grabinschriften, 803, with parallels; contrast No. 1 above, verse 8); for ἰ-στήλη, see BRIXHE, Essai, 115-6.

8. Prose and verse epitaph for Aur. Papas

Stele of grey limestone, apparently complete; inscription in moulded panel. On upper moulding, cross in relief, attached to vine tendrils. Below the inscription, incised depiction of a plough. **Fig. 8** (photograph).

Çeşmelisebil, in the wall of a house (J. G. C. ANDERSON, 1898; W. M. CALDER, 1925).

Ht. 0.84 (panel, 0.59); W. 0.625 (panel, 0.51); Th. 0.25; letters 0.020–0.035.

J. G. C. ANDERSON, JHS 19, 1899, 284, no. 175; W. M. CALDER, MAMA I 362 (not in SGO III).

1-6	† Αὐρ. Νέων Νέω νος τῷ ἰδίῳ ἅ δελφῷ γλυκυ τάτῳ Αὐρ. Παπα
	ἀνέστησεν μνή μης χάριν.
7-9	ν.1 πεδνὸς ἐὼν ἀγαθὸς πάντων πολὺ φίλτ ατος ἦεν

²⁷ The second verse reads ἐνθάδε γῇ κατέχει· σεμνὸν τρόπον ὧδ' ἐκάλυψεν. MCLEAN prints ἐνθάδε τε κατέχει, but the stone clearly carries γῇ (already suggested by MERKELBACH and STAUBER), as I confirmed on a visit to the Konya museum in 2004 (here, **Fig. 7**). While metrically correct, this verse is rather difficult to interpret («here the earth holds (her); thus it has concealed her sober manner»), and lacks a connective to link the two main verbs; quite possibly the two halves of the verse have been recycled from a different text. In the main relief panel, the slave standing at left is labelled «Χρυσήϊς», not, as MCLEAN prints, «χρηστή ΙΣ» (*sic*).

«Aur. Neon, son of Neon, set (this) up for his own sweetest brother, Aur. Papas, in remembrance. He was a good child, and was far the dearest of all; his mother was Valentilla.»

This text consists of a single line of verse inserted into a prose epitaph: for other instances, cf. e.g. MAMA I 306 (SGO III 14/05/02: Atlanti); MAMA VII 240 (SGO III 16/45/06: Turgut), where «Vers 1» and «Vers 3» are in fact in prose.

Verse 1 For the phrase παιδὸς ἐὼν, «while still a child», cf. Od. 21.21, 24.338. The phrase πάντων πολὺ φίλτατος is a slightly awkward combination of the Homeric πολὺ φίλτατος (see the commentary to No. 5 above, verse 2) and the Christian epitaphic phrase πάντων φίλος, richly attested in the early Christian epigraphy of Ankara (e.g. J. G. C. ANDERSON, JHS 19, 1899, 97, no. 79, and 98, no. 84; SEG 6, 29; SEG 27, 873-4, 878, 880, 887) and elsewhere on the Anatolian plateau (e.g. KILyk 408 [Dorla]; I.Pessinous 113; RECAM II 519 [Alaca]).

9. Verse epitaph for Nonnie

Stele of grey limestone, broken below. Plain pilasters to left and right, supporting an arched pediment. In the pediment, cross in relief, in a circle attached to the base of the pediment.

Incised leaves on the arch and base of the pediment. **Fig. 9** (photograph).

Çeşmelisebil, in the courtyard of a house (W. M. CALDER, 1925).

Ht. 0.55; W. 0.62; Th. 0.31; letters 0.025–0.030.

W. M. CALDER, MAMA I 370 (SEG 6, 288; SGO III 14/02/11).

1-2	ν.1	ἀέ(ν)αον τόδε σῆμα τύμβ[ω] ἔπι πῆξε μέγιστον
2-4	ν.2	υἱὸς ἀρη τῆρος Μ[α]κ[ε]δόνιος Διομή δους
4-6	ν.3	μνήμην ἐῆς ἀλόχου Νοννιης πινυτῆς περ ἐ ούσης
6	ν.4	ἦ χάριν κὲ κῦδος [--]

Line 1: ΔΕΣΛΟΝ *lapis*.

«Makedonios, son of the priest Diomedes, fixed this huge eternal marker on the tomb, as a memorial for his wife Nonnie, prudent as she was, who [possessed] grace and glory [– –]»

Verse 1 CALDER comments «The composer found δ' ἐσθλόν in a model, and took it to be a single word». W. PEEK, *Gnomon* 7, 1931, 531 (SEG 6, 288), plausibly interpreted the sequence ΔΕΣΛΟΝ as a mason's error for ἀέναν; cf. SGO III 16/32/12 (Kotiaion), ἀένεον τόδε σῆμα. For the verb πήγνυμι in this context, cf. MAMA VII 584 (SGO III 14/03/04: Zengen), ἰστήλην εὐτυκτον πῆξεν ἐπὶ σήματι τῷδε; MAMA VIII 221a (SGO III 14/10/01: Kana), στήλην ἐπὶ τύμβῳ ἔπηξεν.

Verse 2 The Homeric term ἀρητήρ, «priest» (Il. 1.11, 1.94, 5.78; Lfgre Band I, cols. 1266-7), is here used to refer to a Christian clergyman. The term is used elsewhere in the verse epigraphy of the region: MAMA I 237 (SGO III 14/06/07, Zivarık: Christian); perhaps in SGO III 14/07/06, verse 9 (Ikonion: pagan; see W. M. RAMSAY, *JHS* 38, 1918, 161). For the half-line reserved for the (unmetrical) personal name, see the commentary to No. 6 above, verse 5.

Verse 3 The noun μνήμην and the personal name Νοννίης are unmetrical. For the hexameter-ending πινυτῆς περ ἐούσης, cf. the Homeric formula πινυτή περ ἐούσα (Od. 20.131, 21.103, 23.361); for the misuse of the particle περ, see the commentary to No. 5 above, verse 4, κυδιμόν περ ἐούσαν.

IV. The «Koçaş poet» (Nos. 10–11)

This poet was responsible for two short epitaphs, each consisting of three competent hexameter verses, deriving from the neighbouring villages of Koçaş and Zivarık. The village of Koçaş lay on the territory of ancient Perta, on the north-east flank of the Boz Dağ range of hills.²⁸ The attribution of the two epitaphs to the same poet is, to my mind, certain: the texts share a distinctive syntactical error (the dative ἔτεσ(ε)ι agreeing with the genitive μούνων), the third verse of each text begins with a term meaning «sweet-voiced» (No. 10, ἡδυεπής; No. 11, ἡδυλόγου), and the deceased (Polykarpos and Dentilla) seem to have been brother and sister. This being the case, it is striking how much the script of the two stones differs: compare **Fig. 10** with **Fig. 11**.

²⁸ Perta: W. RUGE, *RE* XIX, cols. 1058-9, s.v. Perta (2); L. ROBERT, *Hellenica* XIII, 1965, 57-69; K. BELKE, *TIB* 4: Galatien und Lykaonien, 1984, 213 s.v. Perta; MAMA XI, pp. xxx-xxxi. The city is named in two inscriptions from Koçaş, MAMA XI 307 and 310. It is unknown how far the territory of Perta extended into the steppe; note that a woman deceased at Kuyulusebil was a native of Perta (MAMA VII 554; SGO III 14/02/02, πατρὶς δέ μιν Πέλτα, with characteristic Phrygian λ/ρ variation – far less likely to be a reference to Phrygian Peltai).

10. Verse epitaph for Polykarpos

White marble fragment, with remains of a moulding at upper edge; broken left, right, and below.

Fig. 10 (photograph).

Koçaş, in a cemetery (M. H. BALLANCE, 1956).

Ht. 0.40+; W. 0.46+; Th. 0.12–0.15; letters 0.015–0.025.

P. THONEMANN, MAMA XI 335.

- 1-3 v.1 [οὔ]νομά τοι, Πολύκαρπε, | [λίθ]ος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμη | [νε]·
3-5 v.2 Παύλου μὲν τέκος | [ῥ]ε νέος ἔτεσ' εἴκοσ[ι] μ[ο]ύνων.
5-7 v.3 ἡδυεπὴς ὄ[χ'] | ἄριστε, λιπὼν φάος | [ἐν]θάδε κῖσο.

Line 2: [θε]ός THONEMANN (MAMA XI); [λίθ]ος CHR. JONES (*per litt.*). Line 4: [ῥ]ς THONEMANN (MAMA XI).

«Your name, Polykarpos, the stone spoke and pronounced. He was Paulos' child, a youth of only twenty years. Most excellent sweet-voiced man, having departed the daylight, lie here.»

Verse 1 Polykarpos was presumably the brother of Dentilla (No. 11 below). The name Πολύκαρπος (itself a Homeric adjective: Od. 7.122, 24.221) appears elsewhere in the region in MAMA VII 30 (Köşmer), MAMA VII 181 (Eldeş). The second half of the verse is a variant on the Homeric formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (Il. 1.361, etc.), with the Homeric aorist of ὀνομαίνω (ὀνόμηνε) substituted for ὀνόμαζεν at the end of the verse; for the verb (ἐξ)ονομαίνω, cf. No. 3 above (the «Zivarık poet»), verse 8. In MAMA XI, I restored [θε]ός after the caesura (lines 1-2); as CHRISTOPHER JONES points out to me, the correct restoration must be [λίθ]ος, as in e.g. IGUR III 1149 (μοῦνον δ' ἡμέτερον βαιή [λίθος] οὔνομα φωνοῖ).

Verse 2 In MAMA XI, I restored the unmetrical (and un-Homeric) form [ῥ]ς at the start of line 4. In fact, the first surviving letter of the line carries a short cross-bar, suggesting the reading [ῥ]ε (= ῥεν; the form ῥε is not found in Homer). This provides much better metre, albeit with an artificial lengthening of the second syllable of νέος. The Homeric term τέκος also appears in MAMA VII 560 (SGO III 14/02/04: Kuyulusebil), and in H. S. CRONIN, JHS 22, 1902, 373, no. 148 (Savatra). The same irrational combination of dative and genitive (ἔτεσι ... μούνων) appears in No. 11 below; the phenomenon is relatively common in late Greek epigraphy.

Verse 3 This verse is a combination of four distinct Homeric terms and phrases, the first three of which are used in the same metrical position as in Homer. The adjective ἡδυεπής is used of

Nestor in Il. 1.248 (LfgrE Band II, col. 892); its synonym ἡδυλόγος appears in No. 11 below, verse 3. As with many Homeric words and phrases associated with Nestor, it seems to have been widely popular in Lykaonia (A. M. RAMSAY, in *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire*, ed. W. M. RAMSAY, 1906, 30-1). The epithet also appears in two inscriptions from Dorla/Aydoğmuş (KILyk 410 and 415), and is applied to Euphemios, the brother of Amphilochios of Ikonion, in a funerary epigram of Gregory of Nazianzos (Anth. Pal. 8.124). The Homeric phrase ὄχ' ἄριστος is frequent in verse epitaphs of the region: cf. MAMA I 232 (SGO III 14/06/20, Dedeler: εἰερέων ὄχ' ἄριστον); KILyk 306 (SGO III 14/12/01, Dineksaray: ὄχ' ἄριστος ἐν ὕμνοις); I.Tyana 57 (SGO III 13/07/05: παιδευτῶν ὄχ' ἄριστος). The phrase λιπῶν φάος (ἡελίοιο) appears in Od. 11.93 (cf. Il. 18.11); cf. also No. 1 above (the «Zivarik poet»), verse 5, λιποῦς φάος ἡέλιον. For the imperative ἐνθάδε κῖσο – a variant on the common epitaphic formula ἐνθάδε (κατα)κεῖται – compare Il. 21.122, ἐνταυθοῖ νῦν κέῖσο μετ' ἰχθύσιν.

11. Verse epitaph for Dentilla

Coarse marble slab, broken below, otherwise complete. Inscription within incised border, with incised guide-lines below each of lines 2-6. At lower left, an incised cross; at lower right, a cross under a *ciborium* (?), roughly chipped at a later date. **Fig. 11** (photograph).

Zivarik, in a house (M. H. BALLANCE, 1956).

Ht. 0.36+; W. 0.37; Th. 0.10; letters 0.013–0.021.

P. THONEMANN, MAMA XI 278.

1-3 v.1 Δεντίλλης τόδε σῆ|μα κασιγνήτης Πολυ|κάρπου,
3-5 v.2 κάλλος ἔχου|σ' ἐρατινὸν καὶ φρένας| ἡλικίαν τε
5-8 v.3 ἡδυλόγου| κούρης ἔτεσεῖ| π[έν]τε| καὶ δέκα μού|νων.

«This is the tomb of Dentilla, sister of Polykarpos, who possessed lovely beauty and intelligence and youth – a sweet-voiced maiden, only fifteen years old.»

Verse 1 Dentilla was presumably the sister of the Polykarpos of No. 10 above. The name Δεντίλλη is extremely rare: cf. IGUR III 1152.

Verse 2 The first part of the verse is adapted from Il. 6.156-7, τῷ δὲ (Bellerophon) θεοὶ κάλλος τε καὶ ἡνορέην ἐρατεινήν/ ὥπασαν. For similar adaptations, see No. 7 above (the «Çeşmelisebil poet»), verse 3, κάλλ(ε)ι καὶ πυνιτῇ καὶ εὐσεβίῃ ἐρατεινῇ (cf. No. 5, verses 6-7); MAMA VII 556 (SGO III 14/02/08: Kuyulusebil), ἡνορέη καλλίστη καὶ ἡλικίην ἐρατίνην; MAMA XI 218 (Aşağı Küçükhasan), πεφιλημένω ὑπὸ πασῆς ψυχῆς δ[ι]ὰ - - καὶ κάλλος καὶ ἡλικίαν. Note that here (as in Nos. 5 and 7 above) the phrase is adapted to describe a woman's qualities. The nominative

participle ἔχουσ(α) is ungrammatical (for ἐχούσης); the author reverts to the genitive in verse 3.

Verse 3 For the adjective ἡδυλόγος, compare No. 10 above, verse 3, ἡδυεπής. The statement of her age (ἔτεσσι πέντε καὶ δέκα μούνων) takes the same form as No. 10 above, verse 2, ἔτεσ' εἴκοσι μούνων, with dative plural agreeing with genitive plural. Here, the orthography ἔτεσσι (for ἔτεσι) is influenced by metrical considerations. Orthographic variation for metrical reasons appears in much of the verse epigraphy of this region. A particularly clear example is provided by two verse inscriptions from Zengen, one of which begins ἐνθάδε **καικήδευτε** φιλόβροτος ἀγλαόμορφος (MAMA VII 582 [SGO III 14/03/02], with κεκήδευται scanned – – – υ), the other of which begins κουριδίη **κεκήδευτε** περίφρων ἀγλαόμορφος (MAMA VII 583 [SGO III 14/03/03], with κεκήδευται scanned υυ – υ). For other instances, see No. 4 above, verse 4; No. 12 below (the «Zengen poet»), verses 3 and 6 (πέδων υ –, πῆδες υυ); No. 13 below, verse 1. Note in our text that the first syllable of πέντε is treated as short.

V. The «Zengen poet» (No. 12)

Aside from its intrinsic interest, I include this text (from the modern village of Zengen/Özkent, 20km south of Çeşmelisebil)²⁹ primarily because of the remarkably bad press it has had from modern scholars. W. M. CALDER, usually a sympathetic reader of late Roman verse inscriptions, comments «The meaning is obscure throughout; the composer was using tags from models whose significance he did not understand ... The hexameter in lines 10-11 startles us in such company. This inscription, on a well-carved and pretentious monument, throws a significant light on the state of education in a Christian village about A.D. 375 to 450; even a bishop who attended the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 449 could not sign his own name». FRANK TROMBLEY suggests that it was concocted «by some local rustic with a grammar school education ... [who] had imperfectly memorized certain sections or phrases found in the Iliad», and MERKELBACH and STAUBER remark simply «Wir unternehmen keinen Versuch, diese schreckliche Komposition zu übersetzen».³⁰

²⁹ K. BELKE, TIB 4: Galatien und Lykaonien, 1984, 244 s.v. Zengen; MAMA XI, p. xxvi and nn. 35-6 (with list of inscriptions).

³⁰ W. M. CALDER, MAMA I, p.199; F. R. TROMBLEY, Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529, 1993-4, II 103-4; MERKELBACH and STAUBER, SGO III 14/03/01.

This is all most unjust. A good half dozen of CALDER's explanatory glosses (on ἀγλαῖων, verse 1; φῆμα, verse 3; λήσεθ', verse 4; κεχαρισμένε, verse 6; ἐνεπλήσθησαν and ἐτέης/ἐπέης, verse 9) are demonstrably wrong, as are two of MERKELBACH and STAUBER's four glosses (ἀγλαῖων and φῆμα); TROMBLEY's attempt at a complete translation of the text is wildly inaccurate. In fact, this is a perfectly respectable sample of late Roman verse, albeit at times rendered difficult to understand by the text's rather haphazard orthography, and evincing only a hazy grasp of the Homeric hexameter.

12. Verse epitaph for Patrokles and Paulos

Stele of bluish limestone, complete when copied by T. CALLANDER in 1906 and by W. M. CALDER in 1908; cut down at top, right and bottom by 1925, when recopied by CALDER. Inscription in plain panel, reaching close to the edge of the stone above and below, with zig-zag course on the left and a curved course on the right. **Fig. 12** (photograph).

Zengen, high in the wall of the mosque (T. CALLANDER, 1906; W. M. CALDER, 1908 and 1925).

Ht. c. 0.55; W. c. 0.77; Th. –; letters –.

W. M. CALDER, MAMA I 382 (SGO III 14/03/01).

1-2	v.1	σῆμα τόδ' ἀγλαῖων κεκασμένυ πῆ δεσ ἄριστυ
2-3	v.2	Πατροκλῆς καὶ Παῦλος ὁμο φρόνως θυμὸν ἀφῆκαν.
3-4	v.3	αὐτὰρ πέδων μέγα φῆμα ἐ(π)ὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμυσι
4-5	v.4	λήσεθ' ἐν μερόπεσσιν· <υ –> τοκέων μένος ἄιραν,
5-6	v.5	ἀνφοτέρων τοκέων, μαλακῶ δεδμημένυ ἄτης.
6-7	v.6	αὐτὰρ μέν μιν πῆδες ἐσθλὸν ἔμοῦ κεχαρισμένε θυμῶ,
8-9	v.7	τόσσον περὶ πολλῆς ἄχος. ἐδίμα{ν}το τήνδ' ὃ γε τίθλον,
9-10	v.8	κὲ γὰρ ἐμῆς φαλάμεσσιν πονησάμεν ος τόδε ἔργον.
10-11	v.9	οὐ μὲν δὴ κροκοπέπλου ἐ νεπλήσθησαν ἐτέης.
11-12	v.10	οὐρανόθεν μέγα κῦδ ος Θεοῦ χάριν ἔλαβον αὐτί,
12-13	v.11	βασιλῆιν οὐρανῶν, Χριστῶ πανβασιλῆ χέροντες.
14-15	v.12	χῆρε, μάκαρ· κὲ γὰρ ἰς σὲ τέλος βιότυο κιχά νι·
15-17	v.13	οὐ γὰρ ἐν μερόπῳ τοκέων χά ριν οὐκ ἐτέλε σαν. †

Line 4: ENI lapis. Line 5: *fortasse* <έων> τοκέων? Line 7: MEHMY lapis. Line 11: ἐπέης CALDER.

«This tomb – my excellent sons, pre-eminent in splendours, Patrokles and

Paulos, gave up their like-minded spirit. But my sons will gain a great reputation among mortal men for their intelligent minds. They took away (?) their parents' strength – both their parents' – when they were overcome with soft doom. But my excellent sons were delightful to my spirit, and (now) equally great is my grief. It was I who built this funerary monument, and I laboured on this work with my own hands. They did not attain the age of the saffron veil (i.e. marriage). But they have received great glory from heaven, by the grace of God, (namely) the kingdom of heaven, where they greet Christ, the lord of all. Hail, fellow: for the end of life comes upon you too. For among mortals they (my sons) did not repay the gratitude due to their parents (?).»

The metre of this poem is poor. In several cases, the author scans words according to his own incorrect orthography, rather than their true quantities: thus πέδων (= παίδων) in verse 3 (υ –), perhaps ἄιραν (= ἄειραν) in verse 4 (– –), πῆδες in verse 6 (υυ); κὲ γὰρ in verse 12 (υυ). In verse 6, the ungrammatical vocative κεχαρισμένε seems to be preserved for metrical reasons; the intended scansion of verse 11, the only verse with no Homeric vocabulary, is very unclear. Bad metrical errors are found in almost every verse: ὁμοφρόνως in verse 2; αὐτάρ in verse 3; λήσεθ' in verse 4; αὐτάρ μὲν μυ in verse 6 (which has to scan – υυ –); τόσσον περὶ πολλῆς in verse 7 (the verse's first two metra); φαλάμεσσιν in verse 8; ἐτέης in verse 9 (which has to scan υ – –, perhaps an instance of the influence of accent on metre); κῦδος and ἔλαβον in verse 10; the whole of verse 11; γάρ in verse 13. There is a single instance of metrical lengthening after the penthemimeral caesura in verse 1.

Verse 1 CALDER glosses ΑΓΛΑΙΩΝ as ἄγλαιον (*sic*); MERKELBACH and STAUBER print ἀγλαίων (*sic*) in their text, with the explanatory note ΑΓΛΑΙΩΝ = ἀγλα(ι)όν. I take it that both CALDER and MERKELBACH and STAUBER understood the word to be the adjective ἀγλαός (i.e. σῆμα τόδ' ἀγλαόν, «this splendid tomb»). However, despite numerous phonetic errors elsewhere in the inscription, the mason nowhere else confused the letters *omicron* and *omega*. It seems more likely that the poet had in mind Od. 19.81-2: τῷ νῦν μήποτε καὶ σύ, γύναι, ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ὀλέσσης / ἀγλαίην, τῇ νῦν γε μετὰ δμῳῇσι κέκασσαι («So beware, woman, lest you too lose all the beauty in which you are now pre-eminent among the maidservants»). If so, ΑΓΛΑΙΩΝ should be understood as ἀγλαῖων, genitive plural of the noun ἀγλαῖα («beauty, splendour»), dependent on the participle κεκασμένῃ («pre-eminent in beauty»); compare AvH 1.5-7, ἱεράπολι ... ἀγλαίῃσι κεκασμένη; IGUR III 1445, [παντοί]αισι κεκασ[μένον ἀγλαῖ]αισιν. The genitive ἀγλαῖων (for ἀγλαῖαις) is unusual with the verb καίνυμαι, but cf. SEG 52, 1457 (SGO V 24/19: Dağdere), σοφίης δὲ πάσης ἐκέκαστο, and the commentary to No. 5 above (the «Çeşmelisebil poet»), verse 6. The

«Zengen poet» was hazy about the distinction between genitive and dative: cf. verse 5, μαλακῶ δεδμημένῳ ἄτης, and verse 6, ἐμοῦ ... θυμῶ.

Verse 2 The adverb ὁμοφρόνως is non-Homeric (and inadmissible in hexameter verse). The poet has in mind Il. 22.263: οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν («Nor are wolves and sheep of the same mind»). I cannot explain why he should have substituted the unmetrical ὁμοφρόνως for ὁμόφρονα.

Verse 3 Note that the word πέδων (= παίδων), with this orthography (ε for αι), scans «correctly» as an iamb; similarly, in verse 6, πῆδες scans «correctly» as two short syllables, though contrast verse 1, where πῆδες retains its true quantities. For this phenomenon (the exploitation of variant orthography for metrical reasons), see the commentary to No. 11 above, verse 3. MERKELBACH and STAUBER, following CALDER, comment that φῆμα = πῆμα. It is true that the phrase μέγα πῆμα, «great misery», is found several times in this metrical position in Homer (Il. 3.50, 9.229; Od. 2.163, 21.305), and the orthographic variation φ/π also appears in verse 8 below (φαλάμεσσιν). But the sense here clearly demands a word meaning «reputation», and it is better to assume that the author intended (τὸ) φῆμα (the neuter otherwise only in Hesychius, s.v. φήματα) as a synonym for (ῆ) φήμη. At the end of the verse, CALDER (followed by MERKELBACH and STAUBER) printed ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμυσι without comment. However, ἐνὶ is meaningless, and it is preferable to assume a simple mason's error for ἐ(π)ι. The author is recalling Il. 20.35, Ἑρμείας, ὃς ἐπὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσι κέεασται («Hermes, who is pre-eminent for his sharp wits»); compare I.Pisid.Gen. 118 (Ariassos), τὴν φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσι κεκασμένην ἐν μερόπεσσιν.

Verse 4 Even on the most charitable interpretation of quantities, this verse remains two syllables short, and my text hence assumes that the mason has omitted a word before τοκέων; one could easily restore here e.g. ἑόν τοκέων, «their parents». At the start of the verse, CALDER glosses ΛΗΣΕΘ as λήσεται, as if derived from λανθάνω. In fact, this seems more likely to be the author's attempt to reproduce the Homeric future form of ληΐζομαι, «win for oneself» (LfgrE Band II, col. 1683), as in Od. 23.357 (ληΐσσομαι) and Hes. Op. 322 (ληΐσσεται). Apparently the author understood this to be a passive form (i.e. παίδων μέγα φῆμα ... ληΐσσεται). It is unclear how the sequence AIPAN at the end of the verse should be interpreted. I have accented it as if it were an aorist third person plural of αἶρω (ἄειραν in Homer), here incorrectly treated as a disyllable; a mangled aorist form of αἶρέω seems to me rather less likely. I assume that the subjects of this verb are the two deceased brothers (as δεδμημένῳ in verse 5).

Verse 5 The phrase μαλακῶ δεδμημένῳ ἄτης, «overcome with soft doom», is calqued on the Homeric μαλακῶ δεδμημένοι ὕπνω, «overcome with soft sleep» (Il. 10.2, 24.678; cf. Od. 15.6). The «Zengen poet» is generally uncomfortable with the dative case (cf. verse 1, ἀγλαίῳ).

κεχασμένῳ; verse 6, ἐμοῦ ... θυμῷ); here μαλακῷ is preserved from his Homeric model, but his own variation on the formula (ἄτης) reverts to the genitive.

Verse 6 The phrase ἐμοῦ κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ, «delightful to my heart», imitates the Homeric ἐμῷ κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ (Il. 5.243, 5.826, 10.234, 11.608; Od. 4.71); note the author's ongoing tendency to drift towards the genitive (ἐμοῦ). The author has mechanically preserved the vocative singular κεχαρισμένε from his Homeric model. CALDER unhelpfully remarks «we need not enquire whether κεχαρισμένοι or κὲ χάρις μένε was intended; the distinction would have been lost on the composer».

Verse 7 The unmetrical phrase τόσσον περὶ πολλῆς ἄχος is a self-contained clause, meaning «just as great <is my> grief»; for ἄχος in this context, cf. MAMA VII 555 (SGO III 14/02/06: Kuyulusebil). The phrase περὶ πολλῆς appears to be a variant on the colloquial phrase περὶ πολλοῦ τι ποιῆσθαι, «to consider something important»; it is unclear why it should have been altered to the feminine, unless to avoid the hiatus. The verb δέμω is often used of tomb-construction in verse epitaphs of the Axylon: Nos. 14 and 15 below, ἐδίματο ... τύμβον, τίθλον ἔδιμεν; MAMA I 306 (SGO III 14/05/02: Atlantı), τύνβον ἐδίματο; MAMA XI 211 (Azak), τύνβον ἔδιμεν; MAMA VII 242 (SGO III 16/45/04: Turgut), δείματο ... δόμον; MAMA VII 232 (SGO III 16/45/05: Turgut), σῆμα ... τόδ' ἔδειμα. Here, the plural ἐδίμαντο is both irrational and unmetrical; the author probably intended the singular ἐδίματο, which is superior in both sense and metre. The hesitation between the use of the first and third person (ἐδίματο ... ἐμῆς φαλάμεσσιν) is very characteristic of Anatolian funerary epigraphy (MAMA XI, Index p. 363; for the reflexive personal pronoun, see BRIXHE, Essai, 80-2). The noun τίτλος (<Lat. *titulus*) is very common in the Christian funerary epigraphy of the Axylon (and extremely rare elsewhere): it is variously treated as masculine, feminine and neuter (cf. Nos. 5 and 6 above). The combination ὁ γέ in this metrical position is common in Homer: cf. also RECAM II 399 (SGO III 15/01/02: Karahamzalı).

Verse 8 For the phrase ἐμῆς φαλάμεσσιν (= ἐμαῖς παλάμησιν), cf. e.g. SEG 30, 1486 (SGO III 16/41/06: Midas Şehri), ἔργον ἔτευξεν ἐῆς παλάμησι; the *nu* of φαλάμεσσιν is unnecessary and unmetrical. The phrase πονησάμενος τόδε ἔργον derives from the Homeric πονησάμενος τὰ ἄ ἔργα (Od. 9.250, 9.310, 9.343).

Verse 9 CALDER (followed by MERKELBACH and STAUBER) read ἐπέης at the end of the verse, glossing it as ἐπέης. However, it is hard to see what this could mean, and CALDER's photograph suggests that we could equally well read ἐτέης (with the upper stroke of the *tau* extending rather far to the right), an irregular genitive of ἔτος, «year» (scanned, impossibly, υ – –; perhaps an instance of the influence of accent on metre, as in No. 1, verse 6, No. 4, verse 4). The κροκόπεπλον ἔτος appears not to be attested elsewhere, but is a perfectly comprehensible poetic

circumlocution for «age of marriage». Greek and Roman brides wore a saffron veil at marriage: L. LA FOLLETTE, The costume of the Roman bride, in *The World of Roman Costume*, eds. J. L. SEBASTA and L. BONFANTE, 2001, 54-64. The sentiment (the misfortune of death before marriage) is very common in verse epitaphs: for the specific reference to marital dress, cf. e.g. MAMA X 137 (SGO III 16/31/08: Appia), οὐ νυνφικὸν στέφος ἔσχον; SGO III 16/31/93 (Altıntaş), D verse 3, πρὶν σε νυνφικὸν ἱστέφανον κοσμήσαμεν ἢν θαλάμοισιν; TAM V 1, 824 (near Göcek), οὐκ ἐν θαλάμοις στέφος ἔσχα, οὐ γονέων οὐχ ἡλικίας ἐνεπλήσθη (i.e. the deceased neither married nor reached the age of parenthood); and, above all, MAMA VII 229 (Turgut: not in SGO), ἦν φθόνος οὐκ ἦσεν γαμοστολίην φο[ρέεσθ]αι. This last text seems to be the work of the same poet as SEG 6, 281 (SGO III 16/45/11: Yunak), which includes the very similar verse ἦν φθόνος οὐκ ἐ[θέ]λησ[ε]ν ἐοῦ ἀπολαῦσε σινεύνου.

Verse 10 The phrase μέγα κῦδος is Homeric (in this metrical position, Il. 8.176, 22.18, 22.217, 22.393), but the sentiment is Christian. Strikingly, the following verse is the only one in the epitaph – for that matter, the only one in any of the sixteen texts studied in this paper – without any Homeric phraseology at all; it is also the most seriously unmetrical, being virtually unrecognisable as a hexameter.

Verse 12 The phrase τέλος βίोटυο κιχάνι is a variant on the Homeric formula τέλος θανάτοιο κιχείη, «may the doom of death come upon (him)» (Il. 9.416; Od. 17.476; cf. Il. 11.451); the indicative form κιχάνει appears in the formula νῦν αὖ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κιχάνει, «now death and fate have come upon (him)» (Il. 17.478, 17.672, 22.436, cf. 22.303).

Verse 13 The repetition οὐ ... οὐκ seems to result from the fact that when Homer concludes a line with the aorist of τελέω, it is always preceded by a negative in the form οὐκ ἐτέλεσεν, «(he) did not fulfil it» (Il. 1.108, 4.160, 7.69, 13.212, 21.457, 23.149). The author has simply reproduced this formulaic pattern, even at the cost of introducing a double negative. However, the intended sense of this verse is not at all clear to me. I tentatively assume that the sentiment is similar to that of Il. 4.477-8, 7.301-2, οὐδὲ τοκεῦσι θρέπτρα φίλοις ἀπέδωκε, «nor did he repay his dear parents for his nurture»; for the verb τελέω in this context, cf. perhaps MAMA I 232 (SGO III 14/06/20: Dedeler), τοκέει γλυκερῷ ἀμοιβῆς δῶρα τελέσσας, «fulfilling a reciprocal gift for his sweet parent».

VI. Examples of the «Axyion verse *koinē*» (Nos. 13–15)

Several dozen Christian verse epitaphs of the Axyion share a common literary vocabulary and «style», with numerous words and phrases repeated and

adapted from one text to another.³¹ Texts falling into this stylistic group are particularly common at Kuyulusebil, but other related epitaphs are found at Turgut (ancient Klaneos) and elsewhere in the East Phrygian steppe. It is very hard to assign this group of texts to distinct «poets», and it is best to see them as representing a kind of local verse κοινή employed by several different writers. I have here selected three characteristic texts, Nos. 13–14 from Kuyulusebil and No. 15 from the nearby village of Gözlü, all of which may (but need not) be the work of a single author. In each case, the poet's grasp of the Homeric hexameter was shaky at best: all three epitaphs include several bad metrical errors.

13. Verse epitaph for Diomedes

«Around is a border of grapes; above, a rosette between two crosses» (J. G. C. ANDERSON; no facsimile).

Kuyulusebil, in a house-yard (J. W. CROWFOOT and J. G. C. ANDERSON, 1898).

Ht. –; W. –; Th. –; letters –.

J. G. C. ANDERSON, JHS 19, 1899, 287, no. 185 (WILHELM, Grabinschriften, 815-6; SGO III 14/02/07).

Cf. J. ZINGERLE, Glotta 16 1/2, 1927, 145 (verse 4).

1-2	ν.1	σῆμα τόδ' ἀτρήσι, ἐν' ἴ ση τίνα τύνβος ἐρύκι·
3-5	ν.2	ἔνθα τυ νῦν κατὰκει ται ναίος παῖς ἀρ(τ) γένιος,
5-7	ν.3	ὅς πολλοὺς ἀκά χησε θανῶν, [ι]δίους δὲ τοκῆα(ς).
7-9	ν.4	οὔνομα Μάρκ ελλος ἀγ(λ)αοῦ Νέστορος υῖος·
9-10	ν.5	αὐτὰρ οὗ μήτηρ σὺν υἱῷ τύνβον ἔτευξαν
11-12	ν.6	μνημόσυνον κούρυσι καὶ ἐσομένοισι ποιθέστε.

Lines 1-2: ἀτρήσι, ἰ ἐν ἴση ANDERSON; ἀτρήσι, ἴ[ν' ἐ]ἴση WILHELM; ἀτρήσι, ἐν' ἴση (i.e. ἀθρήσει, ἴν' εἴση) SGO. Lines 4-5: ΑΡΧΙ|ΓΕΝΙΟΣ *lapis*; ἀρ(τ)|γένιος WILHELM. Line 6: [.]ΑΙΘΥΣ *lapis*; αἰοῦς ANDERSON, WILHELM; [ι]δίους SGO. Line 7: ΤΟΚΗΑ *lapis*. Line 8: ΑΓΑΟΥ *lapis*; ἀγα(θ)οῦ ANDERSON; ἀγαοῦ (i.e. ἀγα(υ)οῦ) ZINGERLE, WILHELM, SGO; ἀγ(λ)αοῦ THONEMANN. Line 9: Αὐταίου ANDERSON; αὐτὰρ οὗ WILHELM.

³¹ In addition to Nos. 13–15 here, see the verse epitaphs from Kuyulusebil published by W. M. CALDER in MAMA VII, nos. 553, 555–556, 559–561 (SGO III 14/02/03–04, 06, 08–10), and e.g. MAMA VII 587 (SGO III 14/04/03: Kolukisa); MAMA VII 242 (SGO III 16/45/04: Turgut); SEG 6, 281 (SGO III 16/45/11: Turgut).

«Look on this monument, so that you may know whom the tomb confines. Here now lies a young child, with his first beard, who in dying grieved many, and (especially) his own parents. His name was Marcellus, son of splendid Nestor; but his mother, along with her son, built this tomb as a memorial for young men also of future generations to hear.»

This epitaph includes metrical errors in verse 1 (ἴση), probably in verse 2 (τυ νῦν), in verse 4 (lengthening of the final syllable of Μάρκελλος and the second syllable of ἀγ(λ)αοῦ) and in verse 5 (αὐτάρ); in verse 5 a short syllable (σύν) is lengthened after the penthemimeral caesura.

Verse 1 A very similar verse is found at the opening of another epitaph from Kuyulusebil, MAMA VII 560 (SGO III 14/02/04), σῆμα τόδ' ἀθρήσας εἶση τίνα τύνβος ἐρύκι. Note how the orthography of the first syllable of εἶση (here, ἴση) is dependent on whether the metre demands a short or long syllable: see the commentary to No. 11 above (the «Koçaş poet», verse 3). The verb ἐρύκω, «confine», is extremely rare in funerary epigraphy; the author probably has in mind Il. 21.63, γῆ φυσίζοος, ἥ τε κατὰ κρατερόν περ ἐρύκει, «the life-giving earth, which confines even the strong».

Verse 2 WILHELM (followed by MERKELBACH and STAUBER) explained ΤΥΝΥΝ as τὸ νῦν; but *upsilon* is usually a phonetic variant for οἱ, as in verse 6 (κούρυνσι for κούροις). Hence it is better to interpret this as the enclitic τοι (cf. ἦ τυ = ἦ τοι in No. 1 above, verse 3). Although unmetrical here, the combination τοι νῦν is Homeric (Il. 8.502, 9.65, 15.211, 17.206, 23.48; Od. 4.238, 12.291). The adjective ἀρτιγέν(ε)ιος (restored by WILHELM; ANDERSON read ΑΡΧΙΓΕΝΙΟΣ on the stone) is not used by Homer, who prefers the synonym ὑπηγήτης (Il. 24.348; Od. 10.279; LfgrE Band IV, col. 748).

Verse 3 This verse closely recalls Il. 23.223, ὃς τε θανῶν δειλοὺς ἀκάχησε τοκῆας, «who in dying grieved his unhappy parents». Note the very similar verse in MAMA VII 560 (SGO III 14/02/04: Kuyulusebil), ὃς πάτρην ἀκάχησε θανῶν, πλῖσδον δὲ τοκεῦσιν. The verb ἀχέω also appears in MAMA VII 555 (SGO III 14/02/06: Kuyulusebil), πόσιν [τ' ἀκ]άχησα, and was twice used (slightly differently) by the «Zıvarık poet» (No. 1 above, verse 7; No. 4, verse 2). In the second half of the verse, ANDERSON read [.]ΑΙΘΥΣ on the stone and restored αἰοῦς (i.e. εἰοῦς, followed by WILHELM); MERKELBACH and STAUBER's [i]δῖοις is preferable for metrical reasons.

Verse 4 The epithet of Nestor was read by ANDERSON as ΑΓΑΟΥ. ANDERSON himself restored ἀγα(θ)οῦ; ZINGERLE (followed by WILHELM) read ἀγαοῦ, interpreted as a phonetically simplified version of ἀγαουῦ; MERKELBACH and STAUBER print ἀγα(υ)οῦ. In fact, given the popularity of the Homeric phrase ἀγλαὸς υἱός in this region (see the commentary to No. 14 below, verse 4), it

seems more likely that we should read ἀγ(λ)αοῦ, with the second syllable artificially lengthened for the sake of the metre. It is striking that we appear to have exactly the same orthographic «error» (ἀγαός for ἀγλαός/ἀγανός) in an epitaph from Nea Isaura (SGO III 14/13/02), Ζευξίδαμος κασίγνητον ἀγαὸν σήματι τεῖσεν (where MERKELBACH and STAUBER restore ἀγα(ν)όν). In both texts, we might perhaps be dealing not with a mason's error, but with a post-consonantal loss of the liquid *lambda*; analogous loss of *rho* is very common in eastern Phrygia (BRIXHE, *Essai*, 113-14).

Verse 5 The second syllable of αὐτάρ is artificially lengthened, and note the lengthening of σύν after the penthemimeral caesura: see further the commentary to No. 15 below, verse 3.

Verse 6 κούροις is Homeric (Il. 9.68; Od. 8.40). The Homeric half-line καὶ ἐσσομένοις πυθέσθαι, «for future generations too to hear» (Il. 2.119, 22.305; Od. 11.76, 21.255, 24.433), also appears in MAMA VII 242 (SGO III 16/45/04: Turgut); cf. also MAMA I 299 (Atlanti: not in SGO).

14. Verse epitaph for Heraklios

«Slab broken above and on both sides. Below the inscription, Maltese cross in circle» (W. M. CALDER; no facsimile).

Kuyulusebil (W. M. CALDER, 1932).

Ht. 0.61; W. 0.31; Th. 0.22; letters 0.015–0.020.

W. M. CALDER, *MAMA* VII 558 (SGO III 14/02/05).

1-3	v.1	βλέψον σήματι, φίλ[ε], καὶ ἰσάθροισον τίς κ[α] τάκιτε·
3-5	v.2	ἐνθάδ' ἀνή[ρ] κατάκιτε σύν ἰδίῃ παρακύτι
5-7	v.3	Ἡράκλιο[ς] μεγάθυμος καὶ Ματ ρώνα κλυτοεργός.
8-9	v.4	τῶν μὲν ἀμφοτέρω[ν] ἐδίματο ἀγλαὸς υ[ί]ός
10-12	v.5	Μιννεας πανάρ[ιστος] καὶ ἀμύμων ἐ[ν] μερό] πεσσιν
12-14	v.6	πατρὶ [φίλω (?)] καὶ μητρὶ πε[ρικαλ] λέα τύμβον.

«Look on this tomb, friend, and observe who lies (here). Here lies a man with his own wife, great-hearted Heraklios and Matrona famed for her skill. The noble son of both of them, Minneas, best of all, and blameless among mortals, built this beautiful tomb for his dear father and mother.»

The metre of this epitaph is haphazard at best. The first verse includes a supermetrical φίλε and an ugly hiatus (καὶ ἰσάθροισον); verse 2 features an awkward lengthening of σύν. In verse 3,

there is no attempt to make the personal name Ματρώνη fit the metre, and I can offer no plausible account of the intended metre of verses 5 and 6. Metrical lengthening after the penthemimeral caesura appears in verse 4 (ἐδίματο).

Verse 1 The vocative φίλ[ε] is supermetrical. For the imperative βλέψον with the dative, compare MAMA VII 553 (SGO III 14/02/10: Kuyulusebil), and SEG 6, 281 (SGO III 16/45/11: Turgut), βλέψον, φίλε, σήματι τῷδε (where φίλε is metrically correct). ἰσάθροισον (note the short initial *iota*) is an orthographic variant of εἰσάθρησον, the aorist imperative of εἰσαθρέω, «observe». The verb is Homeric (only in Il. 3.450, εἴ που ἐσαθρήσειεν Ἀλέξανδρον θεοειδέα, «if he might anywhere catch sight of godlike Alexandros»). However, the orthographic variation η/οι is rather unusual, and it is possible that the poet is conflating ἀθρέω with ἀθροίζω.

Verse 2 For the artificial lengthening of σύν, see the commentary to No. 15 below, verse 3. The Homeric term παράκοιτις (in Homer almost always at the line-end, as here) is rather rare in the epigraphy of inner Anatolia; it also appears in SEG 6, 281 (SGO III 16/45/11: Turgut); MAMA X 540 (SGO III 16/22/04: Tiberiopolis); SGO III 16/31/82 (Upper Tembris valley).

Verse 3 The second and third syllables of Ἡράκλιο[ς] have to scan short (contrast No. 7 above, verse 4, where both are treated as long), and Ματρώνη is treated – outrageously – as an anapaest. The common Homeric epithet μέγαθυμος is rare in Anatolian verse epitaphs: it seems otherwise only to appear in MAMA VIII 221a (SGO III 14/10/01: Kana), and in J. G. C. ANDERSON, JHS 19, 1899, 304, no. 239 (SGO III 16/43/07: Kurtuşağı); cf. also M. STEIN, ZPE 174, 2010, 59-60. The epithet κλυτοεργός is even more unusual. It is found once in Homer, of the god Hephaistos (Od. 8.345; LfgrE Band II, col. 1461); its only other appearance in epigraphy seems to be in IGUR III 1222 (the epitaph of an Aphrodisian sculptor at Rome). The transferral of the term to a woman in this text is very striking; compare the praise of a certain Domna for her φιλεργία in KILyk 316 (Alkaran/Yenisu).

Verse 4 For the use of the verb δέμω for tomb-construction in this region, see the commentary to No. 12 above (the «Zengen poet»), verse 7; here the first syllable of ἐδίματο is lengthened after the caesura. The phrase ἀγλαὸς υἱός is a regular line-closing formula in Homer (nineteen examples, eight of them in the fifth book of the Iliad). It also appears in No. 15 below, verse 2, and in MAMA VII 561 (SGO III 14/02/03: Kuyulusebil); cf. also No. 13 above, verse 4 (ἀγ(λ)αοῦ Νέστορος υἱός), and I.BurdurMus 204 (ἀγλαοῦ υἱόν ... ἀγλαὸς ἴνις).

Verse 5 It is difficult to see how the poet intended the metre of this verse (and of verse 6 below) to work. A very similar sentiment appears in RECAM II 233 (SGO III 15/02/98), χαῖρε γυνή πανάριστε καὶ ἐν ζώοισιν ἀμεμφής. The epithet πανάριστος is not Homeric, although it appears in Hesiod (Op. 293) and in three other epitaphs from this region: MAMA VII 556 and 559 (SGO III

14/02/08–09: both Kuyulusebil); MAMA VII 587 (SGO III 14/04/03: Kolukisa). For the epithet ἀμύμων, cf. MAMA VII 232 (SGO 16/45/05: Turgut).

Verse 6 The phrase περικαλλέα τύμβον also appears in MAMA VII 561 (SGO III 14/02/03: Kuyulusebil). The adjective περικαλλέα appears some fifteen times in Homer in this metrical position, with various different nouns (νῆα, βωμόν, δίφρον etc.).

15. Verse epitaph for Eugenios

«A rough stele, rounded at the top. Above the inscription, four arches. On the borders r. and l. a curved pattern is incised. The text (cut between incised lines) is complete and certain» (W. M. CALDER; no facsimile).

Gözlü (W. M. CALDER, 1913).

Ht. –; W. –; Th. –; letters –.

W. M. CALDER, JHS 46, 1926, 25-6 no. 82 (M. N. TOD, CQ 23/1, 1929, 5-6; SEG 6, 291; SGO III 14/04/02).

Cf. WILHELM, Grabinschriften, 811-12 (verse 1).

1-3	ν.1	† ὕος ἀνὴρ βῆενεν ἀμιδέα δώματα N INΥ;
3-5	ν.2	Εὐγένιος Σύρου μεγαλήτορος ἀγλα ὸς υἱός,
5-7	ν.3	σὺν ἀλόχῳ δευτέρῃ κεκλημένη τοῦνομα Θέκλα,
7-10	ν.4	ὅς κὲ τίθλον ἔδιμεν· τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θα νόντων.
11		αἶω

Lines 3-4: N|INΥ CALDER; <Α>|<δο>ν TOD, WILHELM, SGO; <Μ>|<ν(ω)> W. H. BUCKLER (CQ 23/1, 1929, 6 n.1).

«What kind of man has gone to the cheerless halls of Hades/Minos? Eugenios, the noble son of great-hearted Syros, along with his second wife, whose name was Thekla. He also erected the inscription: for this is the honour due to the dead.»

Points of metrical interest here are the lengthening after the penthemimeral caesura in verse 1, the artificially lengthened σὺν and the shortened first syllable of δευτέρῃ in verse 3, and the superfluous *nu* of ἔδιμεν in verse 4.

Verse 1 The difficult orthography of this verse encouraged CALDER to think that it might have

been «based on a Phrygian formula»; in fact, as TOD pointed out, the verse is in ordinary Greek (οἷος ἀνὴρ βαῖνεν ἀμειδέα δώματα). TOD took the initial οἷος to be exclamatory, but WILHELM was surely right to see it as a rhetorical question («What kind of man ...?»), cf. MAMA I 233 (Dedeler), πῦος ἀνὴρ ἐνθάδε κῆτε; SEG 6, 159 (SGO III 16/31/85: Upper Tembris valley), εἰ [δ]ὲ θε[λ]ις, φίλε, γνῶθι ὅποῖος ἀνὴρ ἐνθάδε κῆτε. The use of βαίνω with a direct object is surprising, and it may be best to see this as a misreading of the syntax of the common Homeric phrase (ἔβη) δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω (Od. 11.150, 11.627, 23.252, etc.); compare IG IX 2, 367 (Demetrias), ἔβης δόμον Ἄϊδος οὐπω | εἴκοσ' ἐτῶν; IGBulg I² 228 (Odessos), πεντεκαεικοσέτης δόμον Ἄϊδος ἀστυφελίκτου / ἤλυθον. The final word of the verse is very difficult: either TOD's <Α>|ι<δο>υ or BUCKLER's ingenious <Μ>|ίν<ω> is likely to be correct.

Verse 2 The Homeric epithet μεγάλητωρ also appears in MAMA VII 239 (SGO III 16/45/07: Turgut). For the Homeric phrase ἀγλαὸς υἱός, see the commentary to No. 14 above, verse 4.

Verse 3 The artificial lengthening of σύν at the start of the verse is very striking. The same phenomenon is found in MAMA VII 553 (SGO III 14/02/10: Kuyulusebil), σύν ιδίη ἀλόχῳ, and (at the start of the fourth metron) in No. 14 above, verse 2 (σύν ιδίη παρακύτι); the lengthening of σύν after the penthemimeral caesura in No. 13 above, verse 5, is less problematic. For the metrical shortening of the first syllable of δευτέρῃ, see WILHELM, Grabinschriften, 801-2, with parallels.

Verse 4 For the phrase τίθλον ἔδιμεν, see the commentary to No. 12 above (the «Zengen poet»), verse 7; here the final *nu* of ἔδιμεν is unmetrical. For the Homeric half-line τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἔστι θανόντων, cf. MAMA VII 560 (SGO III 14/02/04: Kuyulusebil), and frequently elsewhere in inner Anatolia (see MERKELBACH and STAUBER's note on SGO III 13/07/02).

VII. Conclusion

Metrically, none of these fifteen epitaphs would pass muster before a skilled Ὀμηριστής.³² Errors of scansion and quantity are pervasive, and personal names are treated in a remarkably casual manner (see the commentaries to No. 6, verse 5; No. 7, verse 5; No. 14, verse 3). Yet as we have seen, the metrical «errors» in these texts do follow predictable patterns: the poets of the Axylon were not just incompetent bunglers. Short syllables are prone to be lengthened at the *princeps* (as in No. 15, verse 3), and metrical lengthening and/or hiatus after the

³² Testimonia concerning *Homeristai* in the Roman East are collected by MERKELBACH and STAUBER, SGO II 10/05/04.

penthemimeral caesura is particularly common (see the introduction to Section II, the «Zivarık poet»). Accent appears to determine metre in the final *metron* in three instances (No. 1, verse 6; No. 4, verse 4; No. 12, verse 9), and some poets seem to have used orthographic variation as a way of easing metrical anomalies (e.g. No. 4, verse 4; No. 11, verse 3; No. 13, verse 1).

These texts present us with a rich and vivid picture of the ethical world of the late Roman Axylon.³³ Men wished to be seen as good (ἀγαθός, No. 8), excellent (ἀριστεύς, No. 1; ὅχ' ἄριστος, Nos. 10 and 12; ἐσθλός, No. 12; πανάριστος, No. 14), outstanding and true (ἔξοχος ... καὶ ἀληθής, No. 2), splendid (ἀγλαΐη, No. 12; ἀγλαός, Nos. 13–15) and great-hearted (μεγάθυμος, No. 14; μεγαλήτωρ, No. 15). They were proud of their physical appearance (κάλλος ἀμείμητον, No. 2) and their physical strength (κρατερός, Nos. 1–3; ἰσχὺς μεγάλη, No. 3); one man had a particular reputation for athletic success (ἀνείκητος, No. 3). Verbal facility was also valued (ἡδυεπής, No. 10). They were concerned for their reputation among their contemporaries: they liked to be popular and much-loved (πολυήρατος, No. 5; πολὺ φίλτατος, Nos. 5 and 8), to be blameless among men (ἀμύμων ἐν μερόπεσιν, No. 14), to have a reputation for sharp wits (φῆμα ἐπὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσι, No. 12), and to serve as an example to young men in the future (κούροισι καὶ ἐσσομένοις, No. 13). The men of the Axylon were proud of their material wealth (πολύολβος, No. 7), particularly in the form of livestock (ἀφνειός ... πολύρηνος πολυβούτης, No. 6); they were proud to have handed their wealth down to their children (ὄλβον τε κτησὶν τε ἐοῖς τέκεσσιν ἀφῆκεν, No. 2).

A woman was expected to be good (ἀγαθή, No. 6) and glorious (κυδιμός, No. 5; πολύκυδος, No. 7; κῦδος, No. 9). Her chief moral virtues were prudence (πινυτή,

³³ It is instructive to compare the ethical values that Amphilochios, bishop of Ikonion in the later fourth century, enjoined on his younger contemporary Seleukos: τὸν τρόπον ἄσκει ... πρᾶον, ταπεινόν, ἐγκρατῆ, στερρόν, γλυκύν, ἀβάσκανον, δίκαιον, ἀνδρεῖον, σοφόν, σεμνόν, φίλεργον, εὐσταθῆ καὶ σώφρονα (Iambi ad Seleucum, ed. E. OBERG, 1969, verses 8-11). For popular morality in late Roman Lycaonia, see further C. BREYTENBACH and C. ZIMMERMANN, Early Christianity in Lycaonia (forthcoming).

πινυτόφρων, Nos. 1, 5, 7, 9), self-restraint (σαόφρων, No. 2; σωφροσύνη, No. 5), seriousness (σεμνοτάτη, No. 6), blamelessness (ἀμώμητος, Nos. 5 and 6), reverence (γερарή, Nos. 6 and 7), piety (εὐσεβίη, Nos. 5 and 7), a gentle mood (ἀγανόφρων, No. 2), wisdom and intelligence (σοφή, Nos. 5–6; φρένας, No. 11). Their physical appearance mattered too: women are praised for their beauty (χαρίεν καὶ ἐράσμιον πρόσωπον, No. 1; κάλλος, No. 5, No. 7, No. 11), their grace (χάρις, No. 9), their splendour (ἀγλαΐη, No. 7), and their sweet speech (μελίρυτος, No. 2; ἡδυλόγος, No. 11). Most striking of all, a woman could be praised for her work (κλυτοεργός, No. 14), with an epithet transferred from the masculine sphere.³⁴

This group of epitaphs also shows a fascinating tension of values between a broadly «Homeric» set of virtues and a new, Christian behavioural ethics. Alongside their traditional Homeric qualities of prudence and piety, women were also praised for their charity to the poor (πτωχῶν θρέπτειρα, No. 5–6). Two young men otherwise full of Homeric virtues are said to have received their pre-eminent glory (μέγα κῦδος, itself a Homeric phrase) from heaven by the grace of God (οὐρανόθεν ... Θεοῦ χάριν ἔλαβον, No. 11). A Christian called Makedonios uses a Homeric term to describe his father's ecclesiastical office (ἀρητήρ, No. 9), and the Christian Eugenios describes himself (with some theological incongruity) as descending into the «cheerless house of Hades/Minos» (No. 15). A man could win his wife through lavish gifts (ἄλοχος πολύδωρος, No. 2), but she was also furnished to him by Jesus Christ (ἦν οἱ πόρε Χρ(ιστὸς) Ἰη(σοῦς), No. 6–7). This last phrase is perhaps particularly telling: the locution ἦν οἱ πόρε (θεός τις) is drawn from the Homeric epics, but the sentiment (Christ's provision of a wife) echoes Adam in the book of Genesis (ἡ γυναῖκα, ἣν ἔδωκας μετ' ἐμοῦ: Gen. 3:12).

In these modest texts, the farmers of the Axylos used the vocabulary and diction of the Homeric epics in order to commemorate their own, very un-Homeric

³⁴ For the social value placed on work in inner Anatolia, see P. THONEMANN (ed.), *Roman Phrygia: Culture and Society*, 2013, 38-9, and J. MASSÉGLIA in the same volume, 104-7.

lives.³⁵ It is surely no coincidence that the personal onomastics of rural Anatolia in the Roman imperial period were also heavily influenced by the Homeric epics: heroic Greek personal names such as Νέστωρ, Ὀρέστης, Δορυμένης, Τήλεφος and others were unusually popular in eastern Phrygia and the Anatolian steppe.³⁶ The concept of «Hellenization» is patently inadequate as a way of describing the uses to which Homer was put in upland rural Anatolia. The point of these epitaphs was not to present the village communities of the Axylon as ethnically or culturally «Greek». Rather, the Iliad and Odyssey offered a language through which the men and women of the Axylon could express their own core ethical values. The village poets of the Axylon did not just take over a ready-made Homeric «package» of conventional epithets; instead, the rich and expressive language of Homer allowed them to single out those distinctive moral qualities which were prized by members of this particular rural society.

Peter Thonemann

Wadham College, Oxford

peter.thonemann@wadh.ox.ac.uk

Figures

Map 1. The Axylon.

Fig. 1. No. 1, Yenyayla: Verse epitaph for Wenawia (photograph: MAMA I 234).

Fig. 2. No. 3, Keşlik Yaylası: Verse epitaph for Apollinaris (photograph: B. H. McLEAN, 1995).

Fig. 3. No. 4, Zıvarık: Verse epitaph for Gennadeios (photograph: MAMA I 157).

Fig. 4. No. 5, Çeşmelisebil: Verse epitaph for Glykera (photograph: W. M. CALDER, 1954).

Fig. 5. No. 6, Çeşmelisebil: Verse epitaph for Zeno (photograph: W. M. CALDER, 1954).

Fig. 6. No. 7, Çeşmelisebil: Verse epitaph for Demetrianne (squeeze: W. M. CALDER, 1954).

Fig. 7. I.Konya 132, Bozkır: Verse epitaph for Fronteina (photograph: P. THONEMANN, 2004).

Fig. 8. No. 8, Çeşmelisebil: Prose and verse epitaph for Aur. Papas (photograph: MAMA I 362).

Fig. 9. No. 9, Çeşmelisebil: Verse epitaph for Nonnie (photograph: MAMA I 370).

Fig. 10. No. 10, Koçaş: Verse epitaph for Polykarpos (photograph: M. H. BALLANCE, 1956).

Fig. 11. No. 11, Zıvarık: Verse epitaph for Dentilla (photograph: M. H. BALLANCE, 1956).

³⁵ S. MITCHELL, Homer in Paphlagonia, in *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, ed. T. WHITMARSH, 2010, 106-9.

³⁶ P. THONEMANN, Heroic onomastics in Roman Anatolia, JRS forthcoming.

Fig. 12. No. 12, Zengen: Verse epitaph for Patrokles and Paulos (photograph: MAMA I 382).

Abstract

This paper offers new critical editions of fifteen late Roman verse epitaphs from the «Axylon», the East Phrygian steppe to the west of Lake Tatta in the Roman province of Galatia. Eleven of these epitaphs are assigned to three individual village poets, the «Zıvarık poet», the «Çeşmelisebil poet», and the «Koçaş poet». The author discusses the evidence which these epitaphs provide for levels of education and literacy in rural Anatolia in the late Roman period, with a particular focus on the use of words and phrases drawn from the Homeric epics. The metre of the texts is analysed in detail, and the paper concludes with a discussion of the social and ethical values expressed in the late Roman verse epitaphs of the region.

Keywords: Verse inscriptions, epitaphs, Asia Minor, Homer, Late Antiquity.