

This pdf is a digital offprint of your contribution in M.-P. de Hoz, J.L. Garcia Alonso, L.A. Guichard Romero (eds), *Greek Paideia and Local Tradition in the Graeco-Roman East*, ISBN 978-90-429-4004-8

[https://www.peeters-leuven.be/detail.php?search\\_key=9789042940048&series\\_number\\_s tr=29&lang=en](https://www.peeters-leuven.be/detail.php?search_key=9789042940048&series_number_s tr=29&lang=en)

The copyright on this publication belongs to Peeters Publishers.

As author you are licensed to make printed copies of the pdf or to send the unaltered pdf file to up to 50 relations. You may not publish this pdf on the World Wide Web – including websites such as academia.edu and open-access repositories – until three years after publication. Please ensure that anyone receiving an offprint from you observes these rules as well.

If you wish to publish your article immediately on open-access sites, please contact the publisher with regard to the payment of the article processing fee.

For queries about offprints, copyright and republication of your article, please contact the publisher via [peeters@peeters-leuven.be](mailto:peeters@peeters-leuven.be)


COLLOQUIA ANTIQUA

— 29 —

GREEK *PAIDEIA* AND LOCAL TRADITION  
IN THE GRAECO-ROMAN EAST

Edited by

MARÍA-PAZ DE HOZ, JUAN LUIS GARCÍA ALONSO  
and LUIS ARTURO GUICHARD ROMERO



PEETERS

LEUVEN – PARIS – BRISTOL, CT

2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Series Editor's Preface – <i>Gocha R. Tsetskhladze</i> . . . . .	VII
Foreword – <i>María-Paz de Hoz, Juan Luis García Alonso and Luis Arturo Guichard</i> . . . . .	IX
List of Illustrations . . . . .	XIII
List of Abbreviations. . . . .	XV
CHAPTER 1    Between Magian lore and Greek <i>paideia</i> : royal education in the kingdom of Pontus <i>Luis Ballesteros Pastor</i> . . . . .	1
CHAPTER 2 <i>Pepaideumenoí</i> and <i>paideia</i> at the court of Hellenistic Cappadocia and the impact on cultural change <i>Christoph Michels</i> . . . . .	19
CHAPTER 3    Local culture and regional cultures in the Propontis and Bithynia <i>Madalina Dana</i> . . . . .	39
CHAPTER 4    Graeco-Egyptian bilingualism: co-existence (and interference?) of two vowel systems <i>Juan Luis García Alonso</i> . . . . .	73
CHAPTER 5    Phrygian in contact with Greek: an overview <i>Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach</i> . . . . .	89
CHAPTER 6    The interplay of text and image as a form of cultural contact in Greek inscriptions from Egypt <i>Luis Arturo Guichard Romero</i> . . . . .	123
CHAPTER 7    Traces of Greek literary tradition in the magical papyri from Roman Egypt: borrowing, adaptation, appropriation <i>Ljuba Merlina Bortolani</i> . . . . .	139

CHAPTER 8	Greek literary tradition and local religion in metrical cult dedications from Asia Minor <i>María-Paz de Hoz</i> . . . . .	161
CHAPTER 9	Greek epic in Pisidia: the Solymi at Termessus <i>Héctor Arroyo-Quirce</i> . . . . .	183
CHAPTER 10	Greek literary <i>topoi</i> and local traditions in the etiology of the ‘Antonine plague’ <i>Juan Pablo Sánchez Hernández</i> . . . . .	199
CHAPTER 11	Greek metrical inscriptions, classical <i>paideia</i> and identity in Late Antiquity <i>Gianfranco Agosti</i> . . . . .	217
CHAPTER 12	Greek-Latin bilingualism and cultural identity in the Graeco-Roman East: <i>Carmina Epigraphica Graeca et Latina (CEGL)</i> from the Middle East <i>Valentina Garulli</i> and <i>Eleonora Santin</i> . . . . .	233
	List of Contributors . . . . .	259
	Index . . . . .	261

# GREEK-LATIN BILINGUALISM AND CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE GRAECO-ROMAN EAST: *CARMINA EPIGRAPHICA GRAECA ET LATINA (CEGL)* FROM THE MIDDLE EAST\*

Valentina GARULLI and Eleonora SANTIN

## *Abstract*

A close examination of three bilingual (Greek-Latin) verse inscriptions coming from Middle East and dating to the Imperial age offers a precious chance for observing the relations between Greek and Roman languages and cultures in the everyday life of the Graeco-Roman East: their texts, languages, personal names and monuments betray a multifaceted cultural context, where the interaction of Greek *paideia* and Roman tradition casts light on a different and more varied local background.

## 1. METHODS AND AIM

Although Greek-Latin bilingualism is the rule in the Graeco-Roman East during the Imperial age, the cultural and linguistic scenario is far from even, since the category of bilingualism covers a wide range of situations and a varied kind of dynamics.<sup>1</sup>

In this light, bilingual verse inscriptions<sup>2</sup> offer precious evidence for relations between languages and cultures in everyday life of the Graeco-Roman East. In particular, they function as a litmus test for defining the roles of Greek

\* Our warmest thanks go not only to the organisers and to the participants in this conference for suggestions and reactions, but also to Gianfranco Agosti, Julien Aliquot, Alessandro Cristofori and Enrico Magnelli for reading a first draft of this paper. In particular, we should like to acknowledge our gratitude to Patrick Finglass, who kindly improved our English. V.G. is responsible for §§ 4-5, E.S. for § 2, both authors for §§ 1 and 5; all contents have been shared and discussed between the authors.

<sup>1</sup> In the following we will be subscribing to the ‘all-embracing’ definition of bilingualism given by Adams (2003, 8): ‘the “term” bilingual will be used here to include even those whose second language is far from perfect’. For different views of bilingualism, see Adams 2003, 3–7.

<sup>2</sup> With bilingual verse inscriptions, we mean inscriptions combining some text in Greek and some text in Latin within the same monument, both being in verse. This paper belongs to a joint research project of the authors, which intends to collect and edit the whole corpus of bilingual verse inscriptions (*Carmina Epigraphica Graeca et Latina: CEGL*). At the moment this corpus includes 23 bilingual verse inscriptions and six further which are doubtful (for metrical reasons, fragmentary status or both), from all over the Greek-speaking world and dating across a wide range of time, from the 1st to the 5th century AD.

and Roman/Latin language and culture and their interaction in their respective contexts, all the more so since the choice of verse reveals cultural ambition on the part of the clients, who want to insert themselves into an ancient and noble tradition of celebrative and funerary poetry.

Dealing with the Graeco-Roman East during the Imperial age raises several questions. What can be regarded as local culture at this stage and within such an environment? What relationship can be detected between Greek and Latin and (as a consequence) between the social, political and military powers that they imply? What relationship – if any – is there between Greek/Latin and other languages? To try to answer these questions, we will focus on three bilingual verse inscriptions from the Middle East included in our corpus: these are private and funerary texts, which mirror the cultural identity of the clients (and sometimes poets) of the monuments more immediately than public texts, which contrariwise convey the voice of authority and thus do not always allow us to identify individual backgrounds and local differences.

## 2. MAIORINUS' EPITAPH

This is the Greek and Latin epitaph<sup>3</sup> of the praetorian prefect Maiorinus.<sup>4</sup> The Greek epigram is incised on three contiguous local basalt blocks belonging to the east wall of an ancient building, now partially destroyed, called the Ma'aref house, in the modern village of Burşr al-Ḥarīri<sup>5</sup> located on the plateau of the Trachonitis (Arabic: Leja<sup>6</sup> or il-Ledjā) in southern Syria. The Latin inscription is lost, but its text is known thanks to the facsimiles of W.J. Bankes and W.H. Waddington. Our text is based on the latter and on a good photograph of the Greek inscription.<sup>7</sup>

τύμβος ὑπουδαίων μακάρων ὄδε· τῶ  
 ἔνι κείται / συγκλήτου φίλον ὄμμα  
 σαόφρων Μαιουρίνος, / οὗ δῦσις ἀν-  
 τολίη τε μεσημβρία τε καὶ ἄρκτοι / πισ-

<sup>3</sup> See *ISyrie* 2474 (*Graeca*) and 2475 (*Latina*); Froehner 1873, 31; F. Bücheler, *CLE* 622 (*Latina*); *Epigr. Gr.* 441 (*Graeca*); *CIL* III 124 (*Latina*); *GVI* 655 (*Graeca*); Robert 1960, 302–05; Feissel 2006, 123–24 (*Latina*: based on an unpublished copy by W.J. Bankes [1786–1855]); *SGO* 22/15/01 (*Latina*: based on the copy by Waddington) and 22/15/02 (*Graeca*); Sartre-Fauriat 2001, 53–56 (*Graeca*); Puech 2002, 341–42; *IGLS* XV.1 241 (*Graeca*) and 242 (*Latina*: based on the copy by Bankes). Waddington observed both Greek and Latin inscriptions, Bankes just the Latin inscription and Sartre and Sartre-Fauriat (*IGLS* XV.1) just the Greek inscription.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Gutscheld, *DNP* s.v. Maiorinus and *PLRE* I, 537–38 s.v. Maiorinus 1. See also Barnes 1992, 255; Petit 1994, 152–53 par. 179; Puech 2002, 341–42.

<sup>5</sup> About the modern village, see *IGLS* XV, p. 299–301.

<sup>6</sup> About this site, see Dentzer-Feydy *et al.* 2017; about the Trachonitis, 31–37.

<sup>7</sup> We wish to thank Annie Sartre-Fauriat for sharing this photograph with us.

τοτάτου βασιλεῦσιν ἀμωμήτοιο τε Κέρ- 5  
του / εὐρύ τε καὶ μάλα καλὸν αἰεὶ κλέος  
ἀείδουσιν. / Τεῦξε δέ μιν ὄριστος ἐν  
ἡμερίοισι Φίλιππος, / αὐτοκασιγνή-  
της πινυτόφρονος ἔκγονος ἥρωος, /  
καὐτὸς ἐὼν βασιλῆος ἀμύμονος ἐσ- 10  
λὸς ὀπάων, / καὶ κτίσε πύργον ὑπερ-  
θεν ἔϋπτερύγεσσι πελείαις, / λαοτύ-  
πων παλάμησιν ἐς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν αἰεί-  
ρας /

**1** ἐνι Sartre and Sartre-Fauriat: ἐνὶ Kaibel, Merkelbach and Stauber || **4** BACIAEYCIN lapis: βασι[ι]λεῦσιν Merkelbach and Stauber: <β>ασι>λεῦσιν Kaibel, Peek and Robert: ΕΛΕΛΕΥCIN, ἐλέλευσιν Waddington: ἐ<π>έλευσιν Froehner | TEKEPTOY lapis: τε Κέρτου Froehner: τε κέρτου (lt. *certus*) Sartre and Sartre-Fauriat: τε κερτου vel τεκερτου Waddington: τ' ἐ<π>ά>ρ<χ>ου Kaibel: τ' ἐ<ν> ἔρ<γ>ο<ι>[ς] Robert: τ' ἐν ἔργῳ vel τ' ἐνεργουῶ Peek

*sede sub hac recubat clarus praetori-  
que praefectus / Maiorinus, virtu-  
te caelebratus magna per orbem.  
haec illi nu(n)c requies fati haec sedis  
aeterna, / Filippi extracta stu- 5  
diis gratique nepotis*

**1** *sub* Waddington | RECVBAS Bankes: RECUBAI, *recubat* Waddington: *recubat* Merkelbach and Stauber || **2** MAIORINVS Bankes: MAIORINOS Waddington || **3** AETERA, *aeter<n>a* Waddington || **4** NVC Bankes, Waddington: *nu<n>c* Sartre-Fauriat and Sartre | SEDIS Bankes, Waddington: *sed<e>s* Sartre-Fauriat and Sartre | *gratique* Sartre-Fauriat and Sartre: *Gratique* Waddington, Robert, Merkelbach and Stauber

Greek: ‘This is the tomb of the blessed dead of the underworld, here lies / the wise Maiorinus, a person beloved to the Senate; / of him, most loyal to the emperors and son of blameless Kertos, / the West and East, the South and North, / sing always the vast and splendid glory. / It was built by Philippos excellent among mortals, / a hero, son of Maiorinus’ own wise sister; / he too was a noble comrade of the blameless emperor, / and above he founded a tower for the well-winged doves, / thanks to the hands of stone-cutters raising it up to the vast sky.’  
Latin: ‘Underneath this seat you lie down bright praetorian prefect / Maiorinus, celebrated through the world for your great virtue. / Now he has this fated rest, this eternal seat, / erected by Filippus, his grateful nephew.’

The first significant issue about this pair of epigrams concerns the context of their discovery and the previously recorded locations of the Latin and Greek inscriptions. Previous editors and travellers who saw both texts, or just one of them, gave different information about their location. The first editor, Waddington, saw both inscriptions in the same building, «dans la petite église», where he noticed also the funerary inscription *IGLS XV 251*. Von Oppenheim<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> von Oppenheim 1899, 185.

claims that he observed the Greek inscription on the external wall of the porch belonging to a big monument called 'the castle' beside *IGLS* XV 251, which is now situated on the wall of the Ma'aref's house but not immediately close to Maiorinus' Greek funerary epigram. Bankes in a document in his archives<sup>9</sup> recorded that the Latin epigram was incised 'on a tablet over an arched recess in a large remarkable edifice at Bossr Harreary'. The last editors, Sartre and Sartre-Fauriat, think that 'le monument sur lequel l'inscription est visible aujourd'hui peut difficilement passer pour le tombeau d'origine', and that the blocks were reused, maybe more than once, in different later buildings.<sup>10</sup>

As we can learn from the last verse of the Greek epigram, the original monument was a funerary dovecote, that is to say a structure intended to house pigeons or doves, a type of monument typical of the Hawran, but also attested elsewhere. In accordance with the opinion of Feissel and the Sartres, we assume that the Greek and Latin epigrams appeared on the same monument, hence our decision to present them side by side in our corpus.<sup>11</sup> This assumption is consistent with Waddington's report, but it is especially suggested by the texts themselves, which reveal a parallel composition of the Greek and Latin versions, following a technique of variation that consists in amplifying or reducing one of the two texts.<sup>12</sup>

The monument description is included in the Greek epigram. This reference to the monument and especially to this specific form of monument, the dovecote, within a metrical inscription, is a typical feature of the Hawran epigraphic landscape.<sup>13</sup> The epigrams are usually incised on lintels within *tabulae ansatae*. In this respect, Maiorinus' one is exceptional among the nine inscriptions describing dovecotes found in southern Syria collected by Sartre-Fauriat,<sup>14</sup> because it is incised on contiguous blocks. This position is puzzling and only an architectural study of the building where the Greek inscription is now visible will confirm the hypothesis (at present the most plausible) of the reuse of the blocks.

<sup>9</sup> Bankes Archive, Kingston Lacy, 47, no. 51; cf. Sartre-Fauriat 2004, 15–53.

<sup>10</sup> See *IGLS* XV, p. 308.

<sup>11</sup> See n. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Four items from our corpus of *CEGL*, including Maiorinus' epitaph, fall into this particular category of bilingual epigrams based on amplification/reduction of Greek or Latin texts: *IGEP* 395, Lebek 1995, 107–53, *I Urb. Rom.* 1250.

<sup>13</sup> This group of inscriptions that describe the funerary dovecote and share different thematic and lexical aspects was partially noticed and studied by Waddington, then re-examined by Will (1949) and analysed as an ensemble which shows 'l'importance du groupement et de l'étude des thèmes pour la chronologie dans une région donnée' by Robert 1960. See now Sartre-Fauriat 2001 II, 69–72.

<sup>14</sup> Sartre-Fauriat 2001 II, 69–70 and 2001 I (corpus) 18, 53–56 (about Maiorinus' inscriptions and the context of their discovery), 69, 80, 96–97, 149, 170–73, 193, 199.



The dovecotes are quite common in 4th-century AD Hawran; some of them can be precisely dated between 354 and 358, others more broadly from the 4th century. Sartre-Fauriat argued that this type of funerary building usually belongs to Christian owners.<sup>15</sup>

However, a long and very well written epigram from Philadelphia-Amman published by Gatier and VÉrilhac<sup>16</sup> proves that dovecotes, as funerary monuments, already existed in the 2nd century AD and shows (at least in this case) that they were related to pagan cults worshipping sky-gods connected with the cycle of seasons and fertility (Zeus and Demeter). It seems therefore that this particular kind of building first related to the rural and pagan world of the ancient Near East, as described by the skilful poet of Philadelphia-Amman, was at some point incorporated into the Christian universe. They were then reinterpreted and translated into formulae that do not reveal always explicitly a Christian faith, but can be considered, in 4th-century Hawran, a kind of crypto-Christianism, because of the nature of the subject itself, since the symbolism of pigeon- and dove-houses raised up to the sky is patent.

The identification of Maiorinus is due to Louis Robert.<sup>17</sup> He is not Libanius' pupil, as some scholars wrongly argued in the past, but his father, the praetorian prefect.

In a letter to Andronicus, governor of Arabia dated AD 357 (*Ep.* 560F = W474), Libanius praises a new disciple, called Μαιορίνος, who was previously the pupil of another teacher (maybe Acacius) and then started to admire and follow him. In his letter, Libanius commends the noble origins of the new pupil, because his father 'held the highest office'. The epigrams of Burṣar al-Ḥarīri reveal that the praetorian prefecture was such a charge. In a recommendation letter for Maiorinus, dated AD 365 (*Ep.* 1510F = W1534), Libanius wrote that his father showed very good skills as a chief in the public administration and that the boy followed in his father's footsteps. The verbs referring to Maiorinus' father are all in past tense, which might mean that the praetorian prefect had been dead for some years in 365.

Maiorinus was the praetorian praefect of Constantius II, son of Constantine, a Christian emperor, enemy of paganism. Maybe he was in charge when the emperor was resident in Syrian Antioch, surely before AD 357:<sup>18</sup> the mention, in the Greek text, of more than one emperor (πιστοτάτου βασιλεῦσιν) sug-

<sup>15</sup> Sartre-Fauriat 2001, 71.

<sup>16</sup> Gatier and VÉrilhac 1989. See now Agosti forthcoming a.

<sup>17</sup> See Robert 1960, 305 and *IGLS* XV, p. 307, n. 30.

<sup>18</sup> Between 351 and 354 according to Barnes 1992; between 344 and 346 according to *PLRE* 538.

gests that he probably served as prefect when more than one emperor was reigning.

The Christian faith of Maiorinus and his family cannot be inferred from the epigram's vocabulary, as will be discussed below, but it seems to be confirmed by the epigraphic sources:

1. *IGLS XV 243*, Χρ(ιστῆ), βο(ήθει) Μαιουρίν<ω>, a now lost inscription of Buṣr al-Ḥarīri, seen by Waddington 'près de la grande église', which can be assigned to the same Maiorinus as the bilingual funerary inscriptions or to a member of his family;

2. *IGLS XV 235*, a dedication incised on the lintel of a church (dated AD 517–518) whose donor, Elias, archdeacon of St Sergius' church, declares himself a descendant of Maiorinus' line.

The family presumably came from the village of Buṣr Al-Ḥarīri/Bosora(?) or had properties in this land for generations. It was long the most illustrious and powerful family in the village, as attested by inscriptions (*cf.* above *IGLS XV 235*). The study of rhetoric, law and Latin must have been a family tradition, since a rhetorical education and knowledge of Latin language were needed to access the highest administrative offices in the Roman East at least until the end of the 4th century.<sup>19</sup>

Maiorinus (fem. Maiorina) is a Latin *cognomen*, used by at least two members of the prefect's family. Different occurrences are attested in the Roman West.<sup>20</sup>

In the Greek epigram three persons are mentioned: the deceased, his father(?) and his nephew, the dedicator of the monument. We do not share Sartre and Sartre-Fauriat's interpretation of ΚΕΠΤΟΥ<sup>21</sup> (genitive at l. 4) as a latinism (κέπτου = Latin *certi*). This form, unattested elsewhere, would be inappropriate in a Greek epitaph competently written by a native Greek-speaker. We prefer Froehner's idea, that Κέπτου is a personal name, but not, as he thought, belonging to Maiorinus (Maiorinus Certus) but probably to Maiorinus' father.<sup>22</sup> The Greek form Κέρτος (Latin: Certus) is rare in the Roman East. We have only a couple of attestations: *IByzantion S65*: Ν(εμέριος) Κορνήλι[ος] Κέρτος (2nd century AD?) and l. 10 of the epigram for the jurist Konon

<sup>19</sup> Rochette 1997, 35 and 167–77.

<sup>20</sup> *CIL III 9565* (Salona, 4th century AD), *CIL V 3729* (Verona, date?), *CIL VIII 24590* = 24656 (Carthage, date?), *CIL XIII 2415* (Lugdunum, date?); *IMS I 151–159* (Moesia Superior, date?).

<sup>21</sup> The reading on the stone is clear, a mistake is highly improbable and there is no need to introduce corrections as did Kaibel, Robert and Peek, *cf. apparatus* and Robert 1960, 302, n. 8.

<sup>22</sup> For a thorough discussion of this interpretation, see Aliquot forthcoming: he argues that Kernos is the name of either a relative or a colleague of Maiorinus. In his view, a parent/child relationship is not assured by the text (see his n. 17). Since the passage is not easy, it is reasonable to keep this alternative open.

of Kolybrassos from Ayasofya in Pamphylia,<sup>23</sup> now dated between the end of the 3rd (295) and the first half of the 4th century (before AD 357/8). The Latin form *Certus* is quite common in the Western provinces and attested twice in the Eastern ones, in Macedonia and Acaia (at Philippi: *CIL* III 666; and Ptoion: *CIL* III 7302).

In the 14-line Greek epigram (seven lines per block) there is no coincidence between verse and line, but the end of each verse-line is highlighted by a slanting stroke (a kind of slash). In Bankes's and Waddington's facsimiles of the lost Latin inscription disposed on six lines, which are not verse-lines, we can see the same type of division marks, but they are used only when the end of verse falls within a line. These signs have the same function in Greek and Latin; the same slanting strokes are attested in another verse inscription of Burṣr al-Ḥarīri (*IGLS* XV 248). The use of the same kind of division marks to highlight the metrical nature of the text reveals a widespread epigraphic habit in late antiquity.<sup>24</sup>

Letters have a different shape in Greek and Latin. Bankes's copy shows that in the Latin inscription the letter form is quite cursive, while the Greek shows monumental and lunate forms (see in particular the different shapes of M, E).

The association of a Latin and a Greek epigram in a Greek-speaking zone of the Roman empire is related to the high position of Maiorinus.<sup>25</sup> The praetorian praefecture in the 4th century was closely linked to the use of Latin not only in inscriptions dedicated by the prefect himself but also in dedications that cities made to him.<sup>26</sup>

The four-verse-line Latin epigram seems a kind of summary of the ten-verse-line Greek one, since only the main textual elements have been selected by the author and simply expressed without long periphrasis and accumulations of adjectives. More than once, one or more Greek verse corresponds to only one Latin hemistich, and the two versions diverge not only in length but also in the quality of the message.

<sup>23</sup> See Bean and Mitford 1970, 74–76, no. 49; Gilliam 1974; Lebek 1976; and *SGO* 18/18/01. About the identification of the Kernos mentioned in the epigram and that mentioned in the epigram under examination, see Aliquot forthcoming.

<sup>24</sup> See Agosti forthcoming b.

<sup>25</sup> Robert 1960, 304.

<sup>26</sup> Feissel mentions a kind of linguistic privilege which belongs to the emperor, the prefect, but not to other administrators, a privilege that is not extended to any place and that changes over time in favour of Greek language (cf. Feissel 2006, 106–07). In our corpus *CEGL*, the other two funerary inscriptions coming from the Roman East and dating from the 4th and 5th centuries are linked to the figure of the praetorian prefect (see Lebek 1995; Feissel 2006, 120, Constantinople, AD 447), or to the emperor and his circle of loyal collaborators (see Traquair and Wace 1909 = *CIG* IV 8612; Feissel 2006, 119, Constantinople, AD 390).

It may well be that they were written by the same Greek-speaking poet who was able to compose verse in Latin. Maybe he was a member of Maiorinus' family (Philippos?) used to practising rhetorical exercises of variation, translation and paraphrase at school.<sup>27</sup>

Each syntagm or sentence of the Greek has a parallel in Latin, as it is possible to see in the following comparative list of pericopes belonging to the first part of the eulogy:

1. *sede sub hac recubas*  
τύμβος ὑπουδαίων μακάρων ὄδε· τῷ | ἔνι κείται
2. *clarus praetorilque praefectus*  
συνκλήτου φίλον ὄμμα | σαόφρων
3. *virtute caelebratus magna per orbem*  
σαόφρων ...  
οἷ δύσις ἀνιτολίη τε μεσημβρή τε κὲ ἄρκτοι  
πισιτοτάτου βασιλεῦσιν ἀμωμήτιό τε Κέρλτου  
εὐρύ τε καὶ μάλα καλὸν ἀεὶ κλέος | ἀείδουσιν.

The Latin is precise and technical in describing the function of Maiorinus (*praetorilque praefectus* [scil. *praetorio praefectus*]) while the Greek employs the expression φίλον ὄμμα,<sup>28</sup> which is vague and ambiguous, as we cannot guess the office of Maiorinus. It was familiar, though, to an educated local reader because this metonymic expression (eye for person) is common in the regional vocabulary of epigraphic poetry and in contemporary poetry.<sup>29</sup>

Latin *clarus* parallels the Greek σαόφρων: in referring to his celebrity, the Latin verse still stresses the social identity of Maiorinus, while the Greek moves to individual and personal qualities. This σαόφρων has also an equivalent in the Latin *virtus magna*.

The simple syntagm *per orbem* is developed in a Greek verse which describes the limits of this *orbis*.

The participle *caelebratus* is developed in a full Greek verse (εὐρύ τε καὶ μάλα καλὸν ἀεὶ κλέος | ἀείδουσιν), which echoes key concepts of Greek *paideia*, and especially of epic poetry, as the words κλέος and ἀείδουσιν make Maiorinus an object of song and endow him with a heroic and epic aura.

<sup>27</sup> The main reference concerning this kind of exercises is the Latin-learning material for Greek students such as the Grammar of Dositheus and the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*. About bilingual texts for language learning, see Dickey 2014; 2016; about paraphrase, see also Cottier 2002.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. ἀγλαὸν ὄμμα in the epigram for the Christian Bassos, see *SGO* 22/21/01 and *IGLS* XVI 523 (Maximianopolis – Shaqqa, Merkelbach-Stauber date AD 356/7; on the dating to the 4th century AD, see Robert 1960, 307–12).

<sup>29</sup> Robert 1960, 303, n. 4.

Only the Greek epigram expresses the personal merits of Maiorinus towards the Imperial power (πιστοτάτου βασιλεῦσιν) and introduces his father's(?) name (ἀμωμήτιό τε Κέρτου) speaking of the quality of the latter, which must have been well known to the local people. All this is represented in the Latin epigram by only the generic institutional label of *virtus magna*.

The second part of the content is related to the dedicator and the monument:

4. *Filippi extracta stuldiis gratique nepotis*  
 τεῦξε δέ μιν ᾠριστος ἐν ἡμερίοισι Φίλιππος  
 αὐτοκασιγνήτης πινυτόφρονος ἔκγονος ἦρωος  
 καὐτὸς ἐὼν βασιλῆος ἀμύμονος ἐσλὸς ὀπάων

While the Latin does not give space to Philippos and qualifies him only in connection to his uncle (*grati*), the Greek also praises the nephew, keeping for him all the traditional celebratory terminology of the Greek epigraphic tradition and clarifying, even if without specifying his charge, his relationship with the emperor (καὐτὸς ἐὼν βασιλῆος ἀμύμονος ἐσλὸς ὀπάων). Such an extension of the praise of the dedicator, who also made a successful career in the high Imperial administration and thereby certainly received a suitable education, suggests that he might be the author of the epigrams.

5. *haec illi nu(n)c requies fati, haec sedis | aeterna*  
 καὶ κτίσε πύργον ὑπερῆθεν ἐῦπτερόγεσσι πελείαις,  
 λαοτύπων παλάμησιν ἐς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἀείρας

The celebration of the monument gives the poet the opportunity to flaunt his rhetorical and poetical abilities in Greek, as well as a reason to celebrate Philip and his exploits again.

From a morphosyntactic point of view, the Greek text appears more correct than the Latin which shows phonetic transcription: *nuc* for *nunc*, *sedis* for *sedes* (unless they are the mistakes of the stone-cutter). *Caelebratus* for *celebratus* is maybe also a phonetic spelling. The abuse of the enclitic *-que* in *pretorique* and *gratique* corresponds to a frequent use of the polysyndeton in Greek (τε).

The metre seems to confirm the better quality and regularity of the Greek compared to the Latin. In Latin the first three verses are dactylic; it is clear that the poet's intention was to write hexameters, but presumably he could not handle Latin metric rules well and he loses control of the prosody. By contrast, in Greek a particular care of metre in the ten dactylic hexameters can be observed: two are spondaic (2 and 5) and two have *tetrakola* (4 and 7).

The strong parallel between the Greek and Latin versions reveals a joint conception of the texts written to be engraved on the same monument and to be

seen together, the Latin to mark the high military and administrative office of the deceased and his proximity to the emperors, the Greek to be read and understood by educated local people. In other words, the Greek epigram praises both the deceased and the dedicator of the monument in a more verbose fashion, while the Latin, the language of the Imperial power, is more technical and precise in expressing the public function of the deceased, a position the Greek alludes to by means of poetical circumlocutions and via the reference to absolute fidelity to the emperors.<sup>30</sup>

Neither the Greek nor the Latin verses present textual elements that would unequivocally reveal the Christian faith of Maiorinus and his family. A vague allusion to eternal rest may be concealed in the expressions *requies fati* and *sedis aeterna*. In the Greek epigram the poet chooses traditional poetic language and uses standard pagan formulae like ὑπουδαίων μακάρων and the common ἐς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν. Such a mix of pagan and Christian imagery, metaphors and formulae within the same poem is intentional and frequent in the funerary epigraphy of the Near East and Hawran during the 3rd and 4th centuries; it is connected to the desire both to display one's classical education and to conceal one's religious faith in troubled periods.<sup>31</sup> We noted, however, that the description of the dovecote might in itself be a sign of Christian faith.

The poet was influenced by the classical models of scholarly education. Sartre and Sartre-Fauriat find epic and tragic echoes in the vocabulary (*IGLS XV*, p. 308), but beyond the epic cover, we find a local set of formulae and themes which make this bilingual epigram 'a local product'. A close comparison with other epigrams of Trachonitis<sup>32</sup> confirms this assertion: for example, the adjective ἀμύμων is also present in the epigram *IGLS XV 248*, l. 2, the only other epigram from the village of Burṣr al-Ḥarīri.

In the Greek version, the last verses have the strongest connection to the local environment. While the Latin characterises the tomb in general terms as a place of rest and as an eternal home, the Greek develops a detailed and precise description in which the explicit reference to stone-cutters' work makes the construction of the dovecote out of local basalt blocks a challenge that mobilises local workers and becomes a village matter.

The linguistic reality of the ancient Near East was multilingual in the Roman era. Greek quickly became the dominant language but shared the linguistic space with Latin (used in the Roman administration and army from the 1st until

<sup>30</sup> Robert 1960, 303, n. 3.

<sup>31</sup> See Sartre-Fauriat 2001 II, 213–29. See also Agosti 2010.

<sup>32</sup> See Robert 1960.

the 4th or 5th centuries AD), Aramaic and its dialects (Nabataean, Palmyrene, Syriac, Samaritan, Hatrean), and Hebrew. In this multilingual context, attested by literary and epigraphic sources, bilingual documents are present but rare. Even more isolated are the cases of Graeco-Latin bilingualism, all related to administrative uses of the linguistic medium or, even in a private context, linked to the army and to officials of the Roman government.

In the Hawran, archaeologists have found only one<sup>33</sup> partially bilingual inscription, an epitaph dedicated by a Roman veteran: the main text is in Greek and only the abbreviations used to designate the legions in which the soldier has served are in Latin (*cf. IGLS XV 210*). *IGLS XV 411* is not really a bilingual text, but rather a double dedication from two dedicants, one who writes in Greek and the other in Latin.

If Maiorinus' epigrams were inscribed as a bilingual inscription on the same monument, we would be facing one of the most developed and complex Greek and Latin inscriptions attested in Syrian epigraphy. This complexity is a tangible sign of the culture and wealth of a local elite composed of high officials who studied Latin to improve their career.<sup>34</sup> They flaunted their wealth through impressive funerary monuments and magnified the greatness and beauty of the buildings through the verse that they had incised upon them.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup> *IGLS XV 411* is not really a bilingual inscription, but rather a double dedication on the same object addressed to Jupiter by two dedicators, one who writes in Greek and the other in Latin.

<sup>34</sup> Rochette 1997, 249: 'the praetorian prefect of the East is necessarily bilingual'.

<sup>35</sup> Concerning the flowering of epigraphic poetry in Hawran's funerary epigraphy, see Sartre-Fauriat 2001 II, 199–203. According to Gatier (1992), the absence or extreme scarcity of inscribed poems in nerve centres of Greek culture as Pella, Gadara and Abila and their presence in Jerash and Philadelphia during the 2nd century AD, in the Hawran and at Petra in the 3rd and 4th centuries AD, and in the Moab between the 5th and 7th centuries, is not to be interpreted as an index of poor Hellenisation of these territories, but rather as a phenomenon of acculturation and a trend concerning the epigraphic evidence produced by a local elite recently Hellenised. In other words, the verse inscription is to be considered as 'a luxury', as a hallmark; the clients and/or the authors of epigrams were the new rich, educated people living in urban and suburban locations, rather than truly cultivated people, such as teachers, rhetors and men of learning who, despite their proficiency in composing verse, could not afford the engraving of texts on long-lasting and magnificent monuments. When they incised verse inscriptions for different purposes they chose monuments that were less lasting and expensive, and thus more suited to their standard of living.

## 3. IOPE'S EPITAPH

This bilingual verse inscription from the 1st–2nd century AD mourns for the untimely death of the 15-year-old Iope,<sup>36</sup> although it does not tell us how she died:

<i>vacat Iope &gt; Hi- vacat</i>	
<i>vacat lari &gt; Caes(aris) &gt; vacat</i>	
<i>vacat uixit &gt; an(nis) XV vacat</i>	
<i>vacat</i>	
<i>quid superos potuit iuuenis laesisse penates,</i>	
<i>quod tumulo Iopes ossa sepulta latent?</i>	5
<i>nec patrio potui gremio mea debita fatis</i>	
<i>reddere nec manibus lumina contegere:</i>	
<i>in P&lt;hr&gt;ygia miserae corpus, Volcane, cremasti</i>	
<i>sumeret ut tellus &lt;f&gt;uneris ossa mei,</i>	10
<i>et quae debebam matri supremo tempore terram</i>	
<i>ponere uel maestos pietatis scindere crines,</i>	
<i>effecit properans mortis quae uenerat hora</i>	
<i>ut genitrix casus fleret ubique meos.</i>	
<i>vacat Ἰοπή vacat</i>	
<i>vacat χρηστή χαῖρε vacat</i>	15
<i>vacat</i>	
τίς τοῦμὸν δύστηνον ἐπ' οὖνομα γράψε τὸ χαῖρε;	
τίς κωφὴν ματέως θήκατό μοι χάριτα;	
οὔτε γὰρ εἰσορόω λαμπρὸν φάος οὔτ' ἐσακούω,	
ὄστέα καὶ σποδιὴ κειμένη ἐνχθόνιος.	
ΠΡΩΙΓΑΡΗΔ ἄλλὰ θρήνων, φίλε, παύεο μητερ	20
Πρειμιγένη, ἀπόθου θυμοδακεῖς δόδυνας.	
τῆς ἐπ' ἔμοι λύπης παραμύθιον ἐμ φρεσὶ θέσθε	
τοῦτον καὶ μακάρων παῖδες ἐνερθεν ἔβαν.	
<i>vacat</i>	
<i>vacat ἔζησεν vacat</i>	
<i>vacat ἔτη ιε'</i>	25

4 *qui* Froehner, Kaibel, Lafaye | *potui* Froehner, Kaibel, Lafaye, Merkelbach and Stauber || 7 *ma<tri>s* Mommsen, Le Bas and Waddington, Lafaye, Kearsley || 8 *PRHYGIA* facs. || 9 *MUN-ERIS* facs., corr. Bücheler || 13 *gen<e>trix* Mommsen, Froehner, Bücheler, Lafaye || 19 *EN XΘONIOIΣ* facs., corr. Kaibel, coll. Leon. in *AP* 7 740.2 ἐν χθονίοις Mommsen, Kearsley || 20 ΠΡΩΙΓΑΡΗΔΑΛΛΑ facs., ΠΡΩΙΓΑΡΗΔ ἄλλὰ Merkelbach and Stauber: π<υκνῶν> δ' ἄλλά, <πάτερ> Kaibel, Lafaye: πρῶι γὰρ ἦδ' – ἄλλά Peek: πρῶι. <πάτερ, σὺ> δ' ἅμα Froehner: <γ>ρ<ά>ψε π<α><τ>ήρ. ἄλλὰ Kirchhoff *apud* Mommsen || 23 *TOYTON* facs., τοῦτον Kaibel, Lafaye, Peek: τοῦτο Le Bas and Waddington: τοῦτ', ὄ<τι> Kirchhoff *apud* Mommsen, Froehner || 25 *ETH IE* facs.: *ETH IG* Chandler, Böckh

<sup>36</sup> See Chandler 1774, 10, no. 28 (prose inscriptions only); *CIG* II 3111 (prose inscriptions only); *LW* 114; *CIL* III 423; Froehner 1875, 26–28, no. 114; *Epigr. Gr.* 298 (l. 1 of the Latin epigram; Greek epigram); *App. Anth.* 2. 350 (Greek epigram); *CLE* 1168 (Latin epigram); *IGR* IV 1577; *GVI* 2006; *SGO* 03/06/04; Kearsley 2001, 61–62, no. 85; Garulli 2012, 266–70, no. 3.1.12.



Latin: ‘Iope daughter of Ilarus slave of Caesar lived 15 years. / How was she able – being so young – to harm the upper Penates, / so that Iope’s bones are buried under this tumulus? / Neither could I render my due to the Fate on my father’s lap, / nor close his eyes with my hands: / in Phrygia you cremated, Vulcan, the corpse of this poor girl, / so that the earth might take on the bones of my burial, / and for her, whom I should have buried at the last time / or torn the mournful locks of piety, / the hour of death which had come quickly / brought it to pass that she who was the parent lamented my misfortunes at any time.’

Greek: ‘Excellent Iope, farewell! / Who wrote the “farewell” beside my unhappy name? / Who dedicated to me a senseless gift in vain? / For I do not look upon bright light nor do I give heed / as I lie, bones and ash, among the gods of the underworld, / [---] but, my dear, cease your lamentations; mother / Pre-*imigene*, lay aside your heart-breaking pains; / as comfort for your grief over me place / this, that even the children of the blessed ones went below. / She lived 15 years.’

Almost nothing is known about this funerary monument: we have available only a facsimile published by Le Bas and Waddington, with no photograph, and its size and original position are unknown. According to the first editors, this relatively long epitaph was inscribed on an ancient marble column, re-employed on the entranceway of a mosque at Seferihisar, in the area of the ancient Ionian city of Teos. Since it is unlikely that a column was reused far from its original context, we can infer that the monument itself came from Teos. Nonetheless, no reference to Teos can be detected in the inscribed text: the only geographical reference is the mention of Phrygia – l. 8, in the Latin text – as the place where the dead girl was cremated. In any case, the lack of any reference to Iope’s fatherland is unusual, and suggests the following conclusions:

- Phrygia was neither the burial place nor the fatherland of Iope’s family: otherwise this would have been emphasised;
- Iope’s family was not rooted in a certain place, and did not have a well-defined tradition and history.

The names of the dead girl and her parents seem to fit perfectly in such a frame.

The dead girl’s name, Ἰοπή, is a Greek name, rarely attested: besides our inscription, there is a Stesichorean passage (Stesichorus fr. 90. 21–23 F.), a 6th-century BC Athenian example<sup>37</sup> and a Late Hellenistic inscription from Miletus (*IMilet* VI.2 449). The variant Ἰόππα is attested at Delphi in the 2nd century BC (*FD* III 6, 91, ll. 7–8, 9, 13: 124–16 BC). Ἰοπᾶς (masc.) and Ἰοπίτις (fem.) are also rare: the former is found at Myrmekion, in Crimea, in

<sup>37</sup> A black-figured Attic hydria (see Walters 1893, 191, no. B 329).

the 4th century BC (*SEG* 37.666.7), the latter at Delphi in the second half of the 2nd century BC (*GDI* II 1698.4). Both inscriptions from Delphi are manumission acts. Ἰο(π)πή was the ancient Greek name of the harbour city of Jaffa, and also a mythological feminine name, attested in several Greek and Latin sources as the name of a daughter of Iphicles<sup>38</sup> as well as that of a daughter of Aeolus and wife of Cepheus, who would have founded the homonymous town in Palestine.<sup>39</sup> The latter version makes the connection of this personal name to Palestine quite strong.

The mother's name, Πρεμιγένη, is a rare variant form of the more popular Πριμιγένεια, a sort of transliteration of the Latin name Primigenia and attested in all its phonetic variants (either with εἰ or ι in the first and penultimate syllable). The Latin names Primigenius and Primigenia correspond to the Greek names Πρωτογένης/Πρωτογένεια: the former are Latin *cognomina* and the latter are Greek names, related to the circumstances of a child's birth.<sup>40</sup> Such anthroponyms were apparently more popular among slaves and women.<sup>41</sup>

Ἰλαρος, Iope's father, had a popular Greek name;<sup>42</sup> its Latin equivalent is Hilarus. In Late Antique Greek inscriptions Ἰλάριος too is found, following the Latin Hilarius, for which a genitive Hilari is also attested.<sup>43</sup> Since the name of Iope's father occurs only in the genitive at ll. 1–2 (Hilari), we cannot be sure whether its nominative was Ἰλαρος/Hilarus or Ἰλάριος/Hilarius, although

<sup>38</sup> Stesichorus apparently mentions Iope as mother of Demophon and daughter of Iphicles (fr. 90. 21–23 F.), whereas Plutarch *Theseus* 29. 1 regards her as daughter of Iphicles and wife of Theseus: Finglass (2013, 44–45) thinks that Stesichorus might be Plutarch's source, since Plutarch seems to know Stesichorus well elsewhere (Finglass 2013, 44, n. 76), and that the name Ἰππη, given in the pseudo-hesiodic *Catalogue of women* (fr. 147 M.-W.) to Theseus' wife might be a mistake for Iope, although the ἱππ- stem does recur in Theseus' genealogy. In particular, he remarks that the character of Iope mentioned by Stesichorus and Plutarch establishes a connection between Theseus and Heracles through Iphicles, a connection well attested from Stesichorus onwards both in literature and in the figurative arts.

<sup>39</sup> Stephanus of Byzantium ι 72 Billerbeck and Zubler: ἐκλήθη δὲ ἀπὸ Ἰόπης τῆς Αἰόλου θυγατρὸς, τῆς γυναικὸς Κηφέως τοῦ κτίσαντος καὶ βασιλεύσαντος, τοῦ καταστερισθέντος, οὗ ἔστι γυνὴ Κασσιέπεια. οἱ Ἕλληνες κακῶς φασιν. After mentioning Iope as daughter of Aeolus and wife of Cepheus, Stephanus brands as false the Greek version of the story, according to which Cepheus was transformed into a star and Cassiopeia, Andromeda's mother, was his wife. Since the *Suda* κ 453 A. explains the proper name Cassiopeia as meaning ἡ καλλονή, 'beauty', and the Hebrew word which generated the name of Jaffa (יָפֹ) refers to beauty (יָפֵן), the Greek Ἰόπη appears as a Greek spelling of the Hebrew name of Cepheus' wife, called by Greeks Cassiopeia, whose daughter Andromeda is the protagonist of a classical myth located in Jaffa (see Gruppe 1889, 93; Tümpel 1890–94, 295; and now Kaizer 2011, especially 17).

<sup>40</sup> On such Latin *cognomina*, see Kajanto 1965, 74–78.

<sup>41</sup> See Kajanto 1965, 76–78.

<sup>42</sup> 158 cases are recorded in *LGPN* (<http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/database/lgpn.php> [consulted May 2019]).

<sup>43</sup> See Perin 1965, 744 s.v. Hilarus.

the genitive Hilari is more common for Ἰλαροῦ/Hilarus. The *cognomen* Ἰλαροῦ/Hilarus is followed by Caes(aris) – with *servus* implied – which is the usual title of Imperial slaves.<sup>44</sup>

In light of all this, Iope was daughter of Imperial slaves,<sup>45</sup> and this allows us to explain the use of Latin within a Greek-speaking context, and the lack of a clear place of family origin, since the members of the Imperial *familia* had to move throughout different regions of the Greek East. Moreover, the choice of a Greek mythological name of Hebrew origin for their daughter may reveal either a high education or a Hebrew origin for her parents, or both. Be that as it may, both the dead girl's name and that of her mother are well attested within a servile context. As said, the inscription dates from the 1st–2nd century AD.<sup>46</sup>

The inscribed text includes prose and verse (elegiac couplets), both bilingual; both Latin and Greek verses are accompanied by a short prose text in the same language. The Latin prose inscription preceding the Latin poem declares the name of the dead girl together with that of her father, and her age; the Greek prose text preceding the Greek poem is the traditional farewell to the dead person, whereas the Greek prose following the epigram indicates Iope's age. Both epigrams begin with a question, which is intended to be unanswered (ll. 4 *quid*, 5 *quod* ~ 16 τίς, 17 τίς), and emphasises the deep complaint about such a painful untimely death; however, this complaint follows different paths in the Latin and in the Greek epigram.

The first couplet of the Latin epigram, immediately following the short prose passage containing the name and age of Iope, refers to her apparently in the third person,<sup>47</sup> and introduces the *ipsissima verba* of the girl from l. 6 onwards, as the passage in the first person singular indicates. Within such a frame the initial question sounds like the reaction of an anonymous *vox populi* to the preceding information, concerning the premature death of Iope; she replies in the following lines. In other words, the poem enacts a sort of dialogue between an anonymous passer-by, who has read the essential and dry prose, and the dead girl herself.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> For Imperial slaves and freedmen a reference work is Chantraine 1967, who deals with nomenclature of Imperial slaves and its abbreviations at pp. 174–88; he records 29 examples of the abbreviation Caes(aris), most from Rome (Chantraine 1967, 175). About Imperial slaves, see also Boulvert 1970; 1974.

<sup>45</sup> See Perin 1965, 798 *s.v.* Iope.

<sup>46</sup> According to Weaver (1972, 52), the omission of *ser.* from the slave indication is particularly common in the Julio-Claudian period (see also Weaver 1964, 135).

<sup>47</sup> That the first couplet is uttered at the third person, is far from certain: however, it is suggested by the use of the personal name without first person pronouns.

<sup>48</sup> On different forms of dialogues in funerary epitaphs, see, for example, Garulli 2014.

The Greek poem is consistent in the use of the first person singular from its beginning: nonetheless, she replies in the following lines to the greeting conveyed by the words Ἰοπή and χρηστὴ χαῖρε, which must be figured as uttered and inscribed on her tomb by the relatives of the young woman. In this case the dialogue develops not within the epigram, but between the prose and the verse passages.

After the initial question, Iope's words show some formal similarities: the negative conjunctions at the beginning of the lines are similar in both texts (ll. 6–7 *nec ... nec*, 18 οὔτε ... οὔτ'), but the Latin epigram focuses on the relationship between the parents and their daughter, whereas the Greek epigram concentrates on the idea of death as annihilation of the person and his world. In the following the similarity between the two texts becomes weaker: the Latin poem insists on Iope's cremation in Phrygia (ll. 8–9), and complains about the unnatural reversal of the relationship among the generations that an untimely death produces (ll. 10–13); the Greek lines turn to the more traditional invitation addressed to the parents to cease lamentations (ll. 20–21), and conclude with the consolatory argument that even the children of the immortals are subject to death (ll. 22–23).

As a result, Iope has a bilingual voice: what is more, she addresses different addressees with different languages. The Latin text – which mentions the name of the dead girl's father, mentions the Penates, alludes to the cremation in a foreign land, and claims about the reversal of the relationship between generations – seems to address an audience external to the circle of friends and relatives, and mirrors an 'external' point of view, belonging to the social context. The Greek text, which includes for sure only the name of Iope's mother at l. 21 (Πρεμυγένη), seems to imply the knowledge of facts and persons, betraying a more intimate, subjective, individual point of view, belonging to the horizon of the family and emphasising the emotional aspects of Iope's sad story (death as physical annihilation of the person, a heart-breaking pain, the idea of a sad destiny which afflicts even the children of the μάκαρες, who therefore appear in a human light).

In this respect Latin appears as the code of social communication, some sort of official and public language, while Greek seems to be the private and familiar language of Iope and her beloved.

A comparison between the two epigrams shows a few metrical mistakes in the Latin text,<sup>49</sup> together with some awkward turnings.<sup>50</sup> The pattern *debita*

<sup>49</sup> Line 10 is hypermetrical.

<sup>50</sup> At ll. 6–7 the harsh change of subject from one clause to the next one makes the passage quite hard to understand, and at ll. 10–13 the syntax changes while in progress, since the relative clause introduced by *quae* has no completion.

*fatis* has some poetic antecedents (for example. Lucan 8. 415, Valerius Flaccus 3. 461). The Greek epigram is composed in a generically Ionic language, and betrays some changes in the pronunciation of Greek.<sup>51</sup> Despite a hiatus at l. 21 (Πρεμιγένη, ἀπόθου), the whole text seeks a poetic diction by using uncontracted forms, as well as Homerisms,<sup>52</sup> to say nothing of the sequence ὄστέα καὶ σποδιή (l. 19), which has a long history in Greek epigram,<sup>53</sup> and therefore betrays some knowledge of this tradition.

The author (or authors) of this bilingual inscription know(s) both languages well and aim(s) at realising a unitary project. Nonetheless, the quality of the Latin epigram is worse than that of the Greek one: whoever composed these lines, he had a better education in Greek composition than in Latin. In other words, Greek *paideia* appears strong enough in this social and geographical context; or better, *paideia* speaks Greek, not Latin, within such a context.

This bilingual verse inscription is one of the 155 bilingual inscriptions collected by Kearsley in Asia Minor (including Mysia, Aeolis, Ionia, Caria, Phrygia and the islands).<sup>54</sup> In particular, Ionia is the area from which most bilingual documents come, especially Ephesos, Smyrna and Magnesia on the Maeander. What is more, a remarkable number of bilingual inscriptions from Asia Minor concern the members of the Imperial family, especially freedmen, who often established close connections with the local communities,<sup>55</sup> but also a few slaves who, if they had administrative or educational duties, were expected to be bilingual.<sup>56</sup>

#### 4. VALERIA'S EPITAPH

Valeria's epitaph – or better Valeria's epitaph and Dassianus' cenotaph – is a marble table, engraved on reuse and kept now at the Museum of Manisa.<sup>57</sup> Its original setting was the city of Maeonia:

<sup>51</sup> L. 17 ματέως instead of ματαίως, with an alteration of the original length. As for φίλε at l. 20, we do not agree with Cougny (*ad l.*), according to whom this is a phonetic spelling for φίλη, which an alteration of the vowel length: in fact, the following μήτερ / Πρεμιγένη, preceding another imperative ἀπόθου, rather suggests that Iope's mother is addressed only from this point onwards, while her father was addressed before that.

<sup>52</sup> L. 21 θυμοδακεῖς, for which: *Odyssey* 8. 185, l. 18 εἰσορόω.

<sup>53</sup> See Garulli 2012, 268–70.

<sup>54</sup> Kearsley 2001.

<sup>55</sup> See, for example, Kearsley 2001, no. 96.

<sup>56</sup> See Kearsley 2001, nos. 47, 89, 61. For a survey on the social groups affected by the phenomenon of Greek-Latin bilingualism – especially merchants, soldiers and members of the Imperial *familia* – see Kearsley 2001, 148.

<sup>57</sup> The inscription was edited by Drew-Bear *et al.* 2004; see also *L'Année Épigraphique* 2004, 1396a (Simone Follet). An older inscription is found on the opposite face of the table (an administrative Greek text surviving in only three lines: see Drew-Bear *et al.* 2004, 415–17), at a right

τίς ἔστιν ὁ ζητῶν ἐν τῷ τίτλῳ τίς ἐνδο[ξάζεται];  
 οὕτως εὐτυχῆς τὴν ζωὴν μετὰ χαρᾶς [διάγοι].  
 τί συ(μ)φορὰν γυναικὸς ζητεῖς ἔνθεν ἢ τέθα[πται];  
 Βαλερίαν εὐπρεπῆ κατέχει τότε ν[- -].

*dum tenera fuera(m) cognouera(m) conpare[m dulcem] 5*  
*singulaque meruit gradatim cuncta dec[ora]*  
*centurio primus domesticus inde trib[unus].*  
*culminis adeptus his uiribus audax ina[ne]*  
*in bello cecidit, sic fata hoc tribue[.t]run[t].*  
*ut Dassianum comitem rursom coniun[gerem] 10*  
*et idem quae sunt humanis rebus adempta s[olacia],*  
*tunc ad carum subolem Hadrianum me pro[duxi]*  
*ut manibus eius que sunt suprema futu[ra].*  
*reddere uita(m) peti, merui prece quodque r[ogau]i*  
*orbe pererrato requiem mihi parcat de[us]. 15*  
*post his tricenos transactos mensibus [annos]*  
*nunc Ludie sedes consedi ultima(m) terram. palma m[ea]*  
*fatis iam debita reddi. palma te queso care ff[- -]*  
*adde sepulti*

suppl. edd. prr. || 4 τότε ν[έαν] dub. edd. prr. || 8 ina[nis] Follet

Greek: ‘Who is that seeking to know who is commemorated in this inscription? / So may he pass his life with a good luck and with joy. / Why do you investigate the misfortune of the woman who is buried here? / The excellent Valeria is kept now n[on].’

While being young I had met my sweet husband / and he deserved gradually one by one all the honours: / first centurion, staff officer and then tribune. / Over the top, vainly confident in his own strength, / he fell in war, this destiny did the fate give him. / In order to join my fellow Dassianus, / and at the same time the delights that are irrelevant to human things, / then I caught up with my beloved son Hadrian, / to receive from his own hands what will be the last honours. / I requested to give back my life, I deserved by prayer what I had asked for, / after wandering all over the world god may grant me peace. / Being sixty years old / now I settled in Lydia as my last place. I have already paid / my debts to the Fates. I pray you, my dear son, / add of the buried [.]’

This funerary monument was build up for the dead Valeria by her beloved son Hadrian – references to her burial can be found at l. 3 τέθα[πται], 4 κατέχει, 15 *requiem*, 17 *ultima(m) terram*. However, this relatively long inscription has a double function, as it commemorates two persons: this is also the celebrative monument of her husband Dassianus, who had died before her in war and probably had no funerary monument – at ll. 6–9 the circumstances of his death

angle to our inscription. The stone has been reused a second time, and its margins were cut out; this destroyed most of the first inscription and the final part of the lines of Valeria’s epitaph. Now the table is broken in four pieces which were put together again.

and his career are described. In fact, the dead Valeria describes her life as that of Dassianus' wife: the funerary monument of the widow which pays great attention to commemorating her dead husband is apparently a type of funerary monument attested in the area.<sup>58</sup>

The three personal names occurring in the inscribed lines – Valeria, Dassianus, Hadrianus – are undoubtedly Latin: Valeria and Hadrianus are quite popular, while Da(s)sianus is a rare *cognomen*, apparently originating in the Balkans.<sup>59</sup> Much more common is Da(s)sius, a *cognomen* of Illyrian origin,<sup>60</sup> and relatively widespread in some areas (Dalmatia, Dacia, Pannonia, Moesia Superior).<sup>61</sup>

The inscribed text reveals that Valeria after her husband's death moved from an undefined place to Lydia to join her dead husband and her son and keep her family together. This suggests that the original settlement of Valeria's family was not in Lydia, and perhaps not even in Asia Minor. All these clues lead us to suspect that we are dealing with a Latin-speaking family.

But what does the language of the text reveal? In this inscription bilingualism is 'vertical'; that is, it marks different speakers. Indeed, the first part of the inscribed text, the Greek lines (ll. 1–4), correspond to an anonymous voice, which can be regarded as that of the funerary monument, which expresses the point of view of an observer, apparently different from the dead people (no personal pronoun is found in what remains of these lines). Yet the following 15 lines of Latin text correspond to a speech that must be figured as uttered by the dead Valeria herself (the first person singular is used throughout the text).<sup>62</sup>

Such a neat linguistic division of the inscribed text is meaningful: Greek appears to be the language for communication within the social context,

<sup>58</sup> In particular, the editors (Drew-Bear *et al.* 2004, 410–11) call the attention to the epitaph of Aurelius Gaius (see Drew-Bear 1981) and that of Valerius Victorinus (see Speidel 1995).

<sup>59</sup> Besides this inscription it is attested only in Rome (around AD 223: *CIL* VI 2389 + pp. 3320, 3339; *CIL* VI. 2833, 2835, 32542 = *EDR* 121800), and in Moesia Superior, at Aquae (modern Prahovo, Serbia) (4th century AD: *L'Année Épigraphique* 1911, 164; *ILLug* 3.1367 = *HD* 28977) and at Ratiaria (modern Archar, Bulgaria) (*CLEMoes* 23). The variant *Dasianus* is found in *CIL* III 3540 from Aquincum (modern Óbuda, near Budapest: see Dean 1916, 165). In *CIL* III 7872 (Dacia, 2nd–3rd century AD) one can read only DASSI(?). Da(s)sianus is derived from Da(s)sius through the suffix *-anus* typical of cognomina derived from *gentilicia*: see Perin 1965, 462; Kajanto 1965, 32–35, 197.

<sup>60</sup> See Russu 1977, 359.

<sup>61</sup> See Lörincz 1999, 93.

<sup>62</sup> The final part of the inscribed text is not entirely legible and unlikely to be complete: at ll. 17 and 18 one can see two dividers. Although it is not clear what the last part of l. 18 and the first part of l. 19 mean, one cannot exclude the idea that the divider of l. 18 marks some change in Valeria's speech, for example of addressee or speaker.

whereas Latin is the usual communication tool within the family circle of the dead Valeria and Dassianus. So, if the clients were Latin-speakers, they must have learned some Greek as a consequence of their moving to Eastern countries. The linguistic and stylistic quality of the text fits this scenario; although the overall quality of the lines is far from satisfactory, a few basic differences can be detected between Greek and Latin. In other words, bilingualism is asymmetrical, from both a quantitative and qualitative point of view. First, the size of the Latin text is more than three times that of the Greek text. Moreover, the four lines of Greek have no complete metrical structure (showing here and there an undoubtedly iambic rhythm), and an awkward and stiff syntax,<sup>63</sup> a poor vocabulary,<sup>64</sup> in part built upon Latin,<sup>65</sup> and more generally a diction simplified and without nuances.<sup>66</sup> Obviously, some phonetic spellings are not surprising in Anatolian Greek.<sup>67</sup>

The Latin text is of a better quality: it can boast a more complete and continuous dactylic rhythm, although not free from error<sup>68</sup> and a more appreciable lexical variety.<sup>69</sup> As for the syntax, hypotaxis and parataxis are well balanced, although most sentences correspond to a single line, and this reveals a decent, but not excellent, command of verse composition.<sup>70</sup> Some interesting phenomena relevant to the history of language can be found also in the Latin text:<sup>71</sup>

<sup>63</sup> At l. 1 τίς is used as an interrogative indirect pronoun; at l. 4 τότε immediately after κατέχει sounds slightly discordant.

<sup>64</sup> Note the same verb repeated from l. 1 ὁ ζητῶν to l. 3 ζητεῖς.

<sup>65</sup> L. 1 ἐν τῷ τίτλω (see García Domingo 1979, 434).

<sup>66</sup> L. 3 τί συ(μ)φορὰν γυναικὸς ζητεῖς.

<sup>67</sup> σφορὰν at l. 3 attests the weakening of the final nasal before a plosive (see Brixhe 1987, 34); Βαλερίαν at l. 4 attests the fricativisation of the voiced labial plosive, whose sign can therefore be used for Latin *lv* (see Brixhe 1987, 39); ἔνθεν might correspond either to ἔνδον as a result of assimilation (Follet) or to ἔνθεν with a confusion between voiced and aspirated dental consonant due to the gradual fricativisation of the latter (see Brixhe 1987, 39).

<sup>68</sup> Ll. 11 and 16 are exceptional, since the former has no clear metre, and the latter is the only regular hexameter.

<sup>69</sup> The only words used twice are the adjective *carus* (ll. 12 and 18) and the noun *fata* (ll. 9 and 18); the only line which stands out as entirely formulaic (an inscriptional formula) is 16 (see *CLE* 1156, 769, 465B); the adjectives *tenera* at l. 5 and *subolem* at l. 12 have a poetic background; when Valeria describes Dassianus' military career, she uses the technical terms *domesticus* and *tribunus*, whereas *centurio primus* is rather the paraphrase of a technical term; at l. 10 she uses also the term *comes*, the next military degree after that of *tribunus*; however, in Valeria's use this term means 'partner', although within the context of the inscription it does not lack a certain allusive strength, as if Valeria wanted to give his husband a late promotion *ad honorem* (Follet, *ad l.*). The inscription includes a poetic reminiscence, such as *viribus audax* at l. 8, for which the editors cite Virgil *Aeneid* 5. 67.

<sup>70</sup> The use of pluperfect instead of imperfect tense is remarkable (l. 5 *fuera(m)*); as is the use of *consido* with the accusative (l. 17).

<sup>71</sup> The letter E replaces AE (*que* l. 13, *Ludie* l. 17, *queso* l. 18: Dessau 1916, 812–13); the letter O replaces V (l. 10 *rursom*: Dessau 1916, 828); the final nasal drops out at ll. 5, 14 and 17 (see Dessau 1916, 824).



in particular, a weakening of the nasal before a plosive is found also at l. 5 *conparem*: this is quite common, but perhaps it is not meaningless to find the same phenomenon in Greek at l. 3 (σφοράν), as a sort of phonetic habit shared by both languages within the same social and geographical context.

The identity of the author is that of a Latin-speaker, with a restricted knowledge of Greek, which does not allow him to go further than four lines: yet his Latin is good enough to weave a rhythmical discourse, relatively independent from the traditional inscriptional and funerary formulae. The quality of the text eliminates the hypothesis of a professional versifier. The editors regard Hadrian, the dedicatee, son of Dassianus and Valeria, as the author of the double epitaph;<sup>72</sup> he might have been a soldier like his father in the same place, as Valeria's words suggest.

Whether or not this is true, this author offers an interesting example of Greek as a communication tool, rather than as a literary language: the use of Greek meets the need to address a Greek-speaking audience, and declare who was buried in this tomb to local people. Latin functions here as the language of the military class, and generally speaking of the empire. And Greek *paideia* has little space within such a social context.

The inscription can be dated to AD 350–375: the role of *domesticus* mentioned at l. 7 gives a *terminus post quem*, since it is unattested before 350; at the same time, the fact that this is a pagan inscription and that we are dealing with a Latin speaking family settled in the East suggest that the monument is not from later than the third quarter of the 4th century.<sup>73</sup>

At l. 15 a reference to a single *deus* not further described might betray a Christian background, but nothing else in the inscription supports this hypothesis.<sup>74</sup>

No further bilingual inscription can be found among the inscriptions from Maeonia and its area collected in *TAM* V.1 164–193.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>72</sup> See Drew-Bear *et al.* 2004, 412.

<sup>73</sup> See Drew-Bear *et al.* 2004, 415, who wonder whether Dassianus was an official of Julian who died during the campaign in Persia, and whether his son might have moved to East after the division of the empire between Valentinianus and Valens in 364, but these are mere guesses. The inscription carved on the verso, legible only for three lines, can be dated on palaeographical grounds (*epsilon* with central stroke which does not meet the vertical stroke) to the end of the 3rd century AD (Drew-Bear *et al.* 2004, 416).

<sup>74</sup> See Drew-Bear *et al.* 2004, 411.

<sup>75</sup> But see Drew-Bear *et al.* 2004, 410, n. 12.

## 5. FINAL REMARKS

The category of local culture changes remarkably over time: during the Imperial age, Hellenisation went so far that Greek could play the role of a local language. This is true in all the cases under examination, despite the different quality of the texts and the different relationship between Greek and Latin: Greek works as the local language, the language for social communication within the local contexts, whereas Latin is the language of the establishment (administration, political power, army).

In Maiorinus' epitaph Greek prevails, and is used to address the local people and to show Maiorinus as belonging to the local world, its culture and its epigraphic tradition. Latin on the other side emphasises Maiorinus' close connection to the Imperial elite.

In Iope's epitaph Latin conveys the official and public message, while Greek gives voice to familiar affections and to a fairly good Greek education.

In Valeria's epitaph Latin prevails and is the family language of an immigrant family, while Greek – which is not mastered well – is used to address the inhabitants.

In other words, Greek may be either language in use or language of culture, and is in any case the local code for social communication; Latin may be either the language of the establishment or that of the family, but functions always as some sort of 'global' communication tool, far from being 'local'.

Neither language necessarily implies a high or low education: indeed, the quality of the verses is rather varied, depending on several variables. However, their role and their nature of 'local' and 'global' are quite clear. What kind of language is this 'local' Greek? This is 'the long established official language' and some sort of 'universal lingua franca of the East', 'the vehicle of the widely admired ancient Hellenic civilisation':<sup>76</sup> it is a flexible language, which can work both as a poetic and refined language and as 'a "practical" everyday Koine'.<sup>77</sup> Any other 'local' cultural heritage is filtered by Greek language and culture.

In other words, within multiple cultural identities of the Near East, Greek and Roman identities play the major roles, different from and – to some extent – counterbalancing each other; by this time substrate cultures are apparently relegated in the backstage and may emerge only in personal names or little more.

<sup>76</sup> Horrocks 2010, 125–26.

<sup>77</sup> Horrocks 2010, 126.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J.N. 2003: *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge).
- Agosti, G. 2010: 'Paideia classica e fede religiosa'. *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 21, 329–53.
- . forthcoming a: 'Le iscrizioni metriche e il ruolo della paideia classica in Giordania'. *Topoi*.
- . forthcoming b: 'Organizzazione del testo e leggibilità nelle iscrizioni metriche greche della Tarda Antichità'.
- Aliquot, J. forthcoming: 'L'épigramme grecque du tombeau de Maiorinus à Buṣr al-Ḥarīri (Syrie du Sud). Poésie funéraire et prosopographie dans la province romaine d'Arabie'. *Syria* 96.
- Barnes, T. 1992: 'Praetorian Prefects'. *ZPE* 94, 249–60.
- Bean, G.E. and Mitford, T.D. 1970: *Journeys in Rough Cilicia, 1964–1968* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Ergänzungsbände zu den tituli Asiae Minoris 3; Denkschriften 102) (Vienna).
- Boulvert, G. 1970: *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le Haut-Empire romain: Rôle politique et administratif* (Biblioteca di Labeo 4) (Naples).
- . 1974: *Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le Haut-Empire romain: La condition de l'affranchi et de l'esclave du Prince* (Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 151; Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne 9) (Paris).
- Brixhe, C. 1987: *Essai sur le grec anatolien au début de notre ère* (Nancy).
- Chandler, R. 1774: *Inscriptiones antiquae pleraeque nondum editae, in Asia minori et Graecia, praesertim Athenis, collectae cum appendice* (Oxford).
- Chantraine, H. 1967: *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser. Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur* (Forschungen zur Antiken Sklaverei 1) (Wiesbaden).
- Cottier, J.-F. 2002: 'La paraphrase latine, de Quintilien à Erasme'. *Revue des Études Latines* 80, 227–52.
- Dean, L.R. 1916: *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions* (Dissertation, Princeton University).
- Dentzer-Feydy, J., Dentzer, J.-M., Renel, F. and Sartre-Fauriat, A. 2017: *Hauran IV: Sahr Al-Leja. Recherches syro-européennes 1998–2008. 1: Le sanctuaire et l'agglomération à l'époque romaine* (Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 209) (Beirut).
- Dessau, H. 1916: *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, vol. 3.2 (Berlin).
- Dickey, E. 2014: 'Teaching Latin to Greek speakers in antiquity'. In Archibald, E.P., Brockliss, W. and Gnoza, J. (eds.), *Learning Latin and Greek from Antiquity to the Present* (Yale Classical Studies 30) (Cambridge), 30–51.
- . 2016: *Learning Latin the Ancient Way: Latin Textbooks from the Ancient World* (Cambridge).
- Drew-Bear, T. 1981: 'Les voyages d'Aurélius Gaius, soldat de Dioclétien'. In Fahd, T. (ed.), *La géographie administrative et politique d'Alexandre à Mahomet* (Actes du colloque de Strasbourg, 14–16 juin 1979) (Travaux du Centre de Recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce Antiques 6) (Leiden), 93–141.
- Drew-Bear, T., Malay, H. and Zuckerman, C. 2004: 'L'épithaphe de Valeria, veuve du tribun Dassianus'. In Le Bohec, Y. and Wolff, C. (eds.), *L'armée romaine de Dioclétien à Valentinien Ier* (Actes du Congrès de Lyon, 12–14 septembre 2002) (Collection du Centre d'Études Romaines et Gallo-romaines n.s. 26) (Lyons), 409–18.

- Feissel, D. 2006: 'Les inscriptions latines dans l'Orient protobyzantin'. In Harreither, R., Pergola, P., Pillinger, R. and Pülz, A. (eds.), *Frühes Christentum zwischen Rom und Konstantinopel* (Acta Congressus Internationalis XIV Archaeologiae Christianae, Vindobonae, 19.–26. 9. 1999) (Studi di Antichità Cristiana 62; Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Denkschriften 14) (Vatican City/Vienna), 99–129.
- Finglass, P. 2013: 'Demophon in Egypt'. *ZPE* 184, 37–50.
- Froehner, W. 1873: *Mélanges d'épigraphie et d'archéologie*, vol. 1 (Paris).
- . 1875: *Mélanges d'épigraphie et d'archéologie*, vol. 2 (Paris).
- García Domingo, E. 1979: *Latinismos en la Koiné (en los documentos epigráficos desde el 212 a. J.C. hasta el 14 d. J.C.): gramática y léxico griego-latino, latino-griego* (Burgos).
- Garulli, V. 2012: *Byblos lainee: Epigrafia, letteratura, epitafio* (Eikasmos. Studi 20) (Bologna).
- . 2014: 'Conversazioni in limine mortis: forme di dialogo esplicite e implicite nelle iscrizioni sepolcrali greche in versi'. In Pepe, C. and Moretti, G. (eds.), *Le parole dopo la morte: Forme e funzioni della retorica funeraria nella tradizione greca e romana* (Trento), 59–96.
- Gatier, P.-L. 1992: 'Répartition des inscriptions grecques de Jordanie. L'exemple des inscriptions métriques aux époques romaine et byzantine'. In *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan 4: Sites and Settlements in Jordan* (Acts of the Fourth Conference on the History and Archaeology of Jordan, Lyon, 30 May–4 June 1989) (Amman), 291–94.
- Gatier, P.-L. and Vérilhac, A.-M. 1989: 'Les colombes de Déméter à Philadelphie-Amman'. *Syria* 66.1–4, 337–48.
- Gilliam, J.F. 1974: 'A Student at Berytus in an Inscription from Pamphylia'. *ZPE* 13, 147–50.
- Gruppe, O. 1889: 'Aithiopenmythen'. *Philologus* n.s. 1, 92–107.
- Horrocks, G. 2010: *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA).
- Kaizer, T. 2011: 'Interpretations of the myth of Andromeda at Iope'. *Syria* 88, 323–39.
- Kajanto, I. 1965: *The Latin Cognomina* (Commentationes humanarum litterarum 36.2) (Helsinki).
- Kearsley, R.A. (with T.V. Evans) 2001: *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia: Mixed Language Inscriptions and Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Interaction until the End of AD III* (IGSK 59) (Bonn).
- Lebek, W.D. 1976: 'Das Begräbnis des Karrierejuriste'. *ZPE* 21, 39–42.
- . 1995: 'Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel und ein neues Bauepigramm (Θεοδοσίου τὸδε τεῖχος)'. *EA* 15, 107–53.
- Lörincz, B. 1999: *Onomasticon provinciarum Europae Latinarum 2: Cabalicius–Ixus* (Archaeolingua 3) (Vienna).
- von Oppenheim, M. 1899: *Von Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golf durch den Haurān, die syrische Wüste und Mesopotamien*, vol. 1 (Berlin).
- Perin, G. 1965: *Lexicon totius Latinitatis 5: Onomasticon* (Padua).
- Petit, P. 1994: *Les fonctionnaires dans l'œuvre de Libanius: Analyse prosopographique* (Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 541; Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne 134) (Paris).

- Puech, B. 2002: *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale* (Textes et Traditions 4) (Paris).
- Robert, L. 1960: 'Épigrammes de Syrie'. In Robert, L., *Hellenica 11–12: Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* (Paris), 296–327.
- Rochette, B. 1997: *Le latin dans le monde grec: Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et de lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain* (Collection Latomus 233) (Brussels).
- Russu, J.-J. 1977: 'L'onomastique de la Dacie romaine'. In Pflaum, H.-G. and Duval, N. (eds.), *L'onomastique latine: Paris, 13–15 octobre 1975* (Colloques Internationaux du CNRS 564) (Paris), 353–64.
- Sartre-Fauriat, A. 1998: 'Culture et société dans le Hauran (Syrie du Sud) d'après les épigrammes funéraires (IIIe–IVe siècles ap. J.-C.)'. *Syria* 75, 213–24.
- . 2001: *Des tombeaux et de morts: Monuments funéraires, société et culture en Syrie du Sud du Ier s. av. J.-C. au VIIe s. apr. J.-C.*, 2 vols. (Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 158) (Beirut).
- . 2004: *Les voyages dans le Hauran (Syrie du Sud) de W.J. Bankes (1816–1818)* (Bordeaux/Beirut).
- Speidel, M.P. 1995: 'A horse guardsman in the war between Licinius and Costantine'. *Chiron* 25, 83–87.
- Traquair, R. and Wace, A.J.B. 1909: 'The base of obelisk of Theodosius'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 29, 60–69.
- Tümpel, K. 1890–94: 'Iope'. In Roscher, W.H. (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. 2.1 (Leipzig), 293–95.
- Walters, H.B. 1893: *Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum 2: Black-Figured Vases* (London).
- Weaver, P.R.C. 1964: 'The status nomenclature of the imperial slaves'. *The Classical Quarterly* 14, 134–39.
- . 1972: *Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperors Freedmen and Slaves* (Cambridge).
- Will, E. 1949: 'La Tour funéraire de la Syrie et les monuments apparentés'. *Syria* 26.3–4, 258–312.